DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 863 SP 019 563

AUTHOR Stayrook, Nicholas; And Others
TITLE Technical Status Report on Staff Development. Final Report.
INSTITUTION SRI International, Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 82
CONTRACT HEW-300-78-0289
NOTE 103p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Cooperation; *Faculty Development; *Federal Regulation; Government School Relationship; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Design; *Program Effectiveness; School Districts; Schools of Education; *Teacher Education Programs; Training Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

Staff development activities for teachers in 20 Teacher Corps projects were analyzed for this report. The primary sources of data were documentation essays and interviews, although self report and demographic questionnaires and training logs were also used. Hypotheses were generated from Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations, research literature, and site visit experiences. The documentation essays are analyzed in two sections. The first section discusses essays written in 1979 on project training practices and the subject focus of the training. In the second section, essays written in 1980 on the contributions of the Teacher Corps to inservice teacher training are discussed. The essays addressed four factors: (1) the impact of federal rules and regulations on staff development programs; (2) the implementation of programs in local schools; (3) Teacher Corps contributions to the local education agency's personnel development system; and (4) the impact of the programs on institutions of higher education. Appendices provide guidelines for writing two documentation assignments. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED214863

TECHNICAL STATUS REPORT ON STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Final Report

January 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nicholas Stayrook

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Education and Human Services Research Center
SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, California 94025
(415) 326-6200
TWX: 910-373-2046
Telex: 334 486

SP019563

SRI International

TECHNICAL STATUS REPORT ON STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Final Report

January 1982

Prepared by:

Nicholas Stayrook, Educational Psychologist
Rhonda Ann Cooperstein, Education Researcher
Michael S. Knapp, Educational Sociologist

Teacher Corps National Evaluation
SRI Project 7702

Nicholas G. Stayrook, Project Director
Richard A. Marciano, Former Project Director
Marian S. Stearns, Center Director
Education and Human Services Research Center

This document has been prepared under contract with the Office of Dissemination and Professional Development, USOE, Contract Number HEW-300-78-0289, Jean Narayanan, Project Monitor. The contents do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education and no official endorsement by the Department of Education should be inferred.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iv

FOREWORD v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS FOR THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT STUDY xv

I INTRODUCTION TO THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT STUDY IN THE TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM EVALUATION 1

II DATA SOURCES AND HYPOTHESES 5
Data Sources 6
Interviews 6
Self-Report Questionnaires 7
Demographic Questionnaires 8
Training Logs 8
Documentation Essays 9
Hypotheses 10

III TENTATIVE FINDINGS 13
Quarter 3 Documentation 13
General Policy Findings 16
Training Process and Strategy Findings 19
Training Program Content Findings 38
Quarter 5 Documentation 52
Primary Focus of Inservice Training 54
Inservice Training Strategy and Delivery 59
Contributions to an Improved Personnel Development System . 69

Appendices
A Quarter 3 Documentation Assignment 81

B Quarter 5 Documentation Assignment 85

TABLES

1 Quarter 3 Essay: Program 78 Response Rates 15

2 Proportion of Projects Responding to Quarter 5 Inservice Essay 53

3 Rankings of Content Goals by Documenters 57

FOREWORD

This foreword gives an overview of the Teacher Corps program and of the Teacher Corps Program National Evaluation conducted over the past 3 years by the Education and Human Services Research Center of SRI International. This report is one of a series of reports resulting from the SRI study.

The Teacher Corps Program

In November 1965, Congress enacted the Higher Education Act (PL 89-329), Title V of which authorized the Teacher Corps program. This program was an outgrowth of similar social programs initiated during the Kennedy and Johnson presidencies. Its purpose was primarily to train teachers to be more effective in teaching children in low-income areas of our country. In October 1976, the authorization for the Teacher Corps program was amended. The statement of purpose for the Teacher Corps program under this authorization states:

> The purpose of this part [the Teacher Corps program] is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation and to encourage institutions of higher education and local education agencies to improve programs of training and retraining for teachers, teacher aides, and other educational personnel--
>
> (1) attracting and training qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies for teaching in such areas;
>
> (2) attracting and training inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available for teaching and inservice training to local educational agencies in such areas in teams led by an experienced teacher;

(3) attracting volunteers to serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants in programs carried out by local educational agencies and institutions of higher education serving such areas;

(4) attracting and training educational personnel to provide relevant remedial, basic, and secondary educational training, including literacy and communication skills for juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders;

(5) supporting demonstration projects for retraining experienced teachers and teacher aides, and other educational personnel serving in local educational agencies. [PL 94-482, Title V, Part A, Sec. 511 (a)]

With this modified statement of purpose in mind, Teacher Corps officials amended the federal regulations governing Teacher Corps and published these in the Federal Register in February 1978. These new regulations specified four outcomes that Teacher Corps projects were to achieve with the grant money they received from the federal government:

(a) An improved school climate which fosters the learning of children from low-income families.

(b) An improved educational personnel development system for persons who serve or who are preparing to serve in schools for children of low-income families.

(c) The continuation of educational improvements (including products, processes, and practices) made as a result of the project, after Federal funding ends.

(d) The adoption or adaptation of those educational improvements by other educational agencies and institutions.

In addition to these four outcomes of the Teacher Corps program, the new Rules and Regulations also stated a number of key program features that, it was thought, would enhance the ability of the projects to achieve the four outcomes. Some of these key features were:

(1) Education that is multicultural.

(2) Diagnostic/prescriptive teaching.

(3) Integrated pre- and inservice training designs.

(4) Community-based education.

(5) An elected community council.

(6) A representative policy board.

(7) A collaborative mode of operation involving the associated institutions, communities, and other vested-interest groups.

In a further analysis of these Rules and Regulations, the evaluation team at SRI found many more key features than the seven listed above. The perspective taken by SRI during this evaluation was that, as a whole, the Rules and Regulations could be viewed as a strategy for implementing a Teacher Corps project. The particular key features making up the strategy could be interpreted as tactics to be used by the projects to achieve the four outcomes.

The new Rules and Regulations modified the Teacher Corps program substantially. Some of the differences between the old program and the new program are listed below.

New Program	Old Program
Five-year project duration	Two-year project duration
Funding of $1.2 million per project	Funding $0.25 million per project
Incorporates a full feeder system of schools	Used only one school
Concerned with training of all school personnel	Concerned with training of teachers and interns only
Includes the community along with the local education agency (LEA) and an institution of higher education (IHE) in the planning and operation of the project	Only IHE and LEA involved in planning and operation of the project

New Program	Old Program
The program is service oriented, but includes demonstration/dissemination and institutionalization as additional outcomes	Was mainly a service-oriented program directed toward teacher education

The changes in the federal Rules and Regulations governing Teacher Corps caused the program at the local level to be quite different from what it had been in previous cycles. A typical Teacher Corps project funded under the new Rules and Regulations spent its first year in planning its particular program. During this first year, a community council was elected, collaborative arrangements were established between the LEA, IHE, and community, and the four major goals of Teacher Corps were restated in terms of local conditions and local needs. About 8 months into the first year, projects were required to submit their continuation proposals for the second year of operation. These proposals were to contain the specific objectives, a description of the community council elections, and other activities that occurred during the planning year. Soon after the submission of the continuation proposal, many projects recruited a teacher-intern team leader and four interns to receive training. The team leader was the person who generally was in charge of monitoring and setting up the program for the training of the interns. The project then sent these people to the Corps Member Training Institute (CMTI).

Starting with the second year of the Teacher Corps project, training was conducted for all educational personnel in the feeder system of schools selected to participate in the project. The training programs planned during the first year were put into action during the second and third years, which are termed the operational phase of the project. In addition, the preservice training for the Teacher Corps interns was also begun at the beginning of the second year. The intern training consisted primarily of coursework taken at the IHE, classroom experience in the Teacher Corps

schools, and a community component that required the interns to become more aware of the importance of the community in the education process. The training for educational personnel in the Teacher Corps schools (including principals, teachers, aides, and others who deal with children in the schools) generally involved the assessment of the needs within the schools (conducted during the first year), the translation of these needs into objectives and goals for training, and the implementation of training sessions designed to achieve these objectives and goals. The training program for the interns was to have been finished by the end of the third year, at which point the interns would have received a master's degree and would also have been certified.

The SRI study covers only the first 3 years of the 5-year program. The fourth and fifth years of each project's life were to have been devoted to dissemination of project products and to the institutionalization of successful practices developed by the project. Because of federal funding termination, the program ends in July 1982. Program 78 thus ends after only 4 years of the intended 5-year cycle, and Program 79, after 3 years.

The administrative structure of a Teacher Corps project did not change much over 3 years. A policy board was established at the beginning of the planning year to oversee all project activities. This policy board consisted of the superintendent of schools from the LEA, the dean of the school of education in the IHE, and the elected community council chairperson. The typical project included other persons on this policy board (e.g., the project director and the team leader) to keep the board informed of project activities and to make recommendations for future courses of action. The elected community council was consulted on all community activities that were planned under the project. The ultimate responsibility for carrying out the Teacher Corps project rested with the project director, who frequently consulted with the policy board members on decisions regarding project direction and expenditure of project funds.

Specifications for the National Evaluation

Concurrent with the development of new Rules and Regulations for Teacher Corps, the specifications for a national evaluation of this new program were being created. In the summer of 1977, an evaluation task force was charged with developing a design for such an evaluation. The results of this task force report set the direction for the preparation of a request for proposal issued in June 1978.

The task force recommended that an 8-year evaluation be conducted by an independent evaluator selected through a competitive RFP. Subsequently, this requirement was modified to a 5-year period, which included three phases of the evaluation. The first phase covered the first year of the evaluation and was considered a planning phase, wherein the study design would be finalized and instruments created to collect baseline information. The second phase covered the next 2 years of the evaluation and was basically considered a data collection phase, in which intensive cross-site observations and local documentation would be collected in the local projects. An option was provided for the funding of phase three (for years 4 and 5 of the evaluation), which would allow some additional data collection and analysis, synthesis, and reporting of the major results of the study.

In addition to this basic study schedule, two additional special studies were requested in the RFP. Special Study I, to be conducted within the first 18 months of the contract, was focused on the issues of collaboration and multicultural education. Special Study II, also to be conducted within the first 18 months of the project, focused its efforts on institutionalization of project practices in the institutions associated with the Teacher Corps program.

The SRI Evaluation Design

The evaluation design proposed by SRI in the summer of 1978 consisted of multiple substudies of different aspects of the Teacher Corps program, a special policy monitoring activity, and the two special studies on collaboration and multicultural education and on institutionalization. There were three overarching goals of the evaluation:

(1) To describe the Teacher Corps program as it existed in the field and describe the strategies used by local projects to implement the Teacher Corps guidelines.

(2) To assess program outcomes in a time-series fashion over the course of the project's life--referred to in the analysis plan as assessing the "impacts" of Teacher Corps.

(3) To describe and assess the efficacy of the processes used to achieve the outcomes--in other words, the implementation practices associated with particular program outcomes or impacts.

Multiple methodologies were employed to study the issues described in the evaluation's RFP. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect data on Teacher Corps processes and outcomes. Qualitative data sources included local project documentation, case-study interviews, open-ended questionnaires, and structured interviews. Quantitative data sources included self-report questionnaires mailed to local project participants, structured observations of Teacher Corps training activities and the physical environment of Teacher Corps schools, and demographic questionnaires mailed to IHEs, LEAs, and local schools.

In the summer of 1978, 79 Teacher Corps projects were funded for the new Program 78 5-year cycle. In addition, in the summer of 1979, 53 Program 79 projects were funded. The scope of the evaluation was to include all 132 Teacher Corps projects funded in the two cohorts. Using a stratified random sampling procedure, SRI selected 30 projects for in-depth study. Additionally, smaller case-study samples were selected for special purposes.

As a result of the first year of the program evaluation, a Project Guide to the Teacher Corps Program Evaluation was prepared by SRI. This guide summarized the design activities that took place during that first year. These guides were distributed to all Teacher Corps project directors, deans, superintendents, and principals of local schools. The Project Guide described the operational plans for the evaluation over the remaining 4 years (given that the additional 2-year option would be exercised); it also described the instrumentation, sampling designs, and evaluation issues to be addressed. A reaction panel (REAP) was also formed during the first year to act as an advisory group to the evaluation team.

During the second and third years of the evaluation, SRI conducted site visits to collect information for the substudies described above, administered questionnaires to various role groups within each project, and conducted case-study visits to selected projects. An interim annual report, submitted in October 1980, presented the evaluation's initial descriptive information on the Teacher Corps program.

The interim annual report summarized information collected during the planning year in Program 78 projects. This included the bringing together of the IHE and the LEA, and the involvement of school personnel and the community. A chapter on the initial description of staff development activities was also included.

The final report was prepared in the fall of 1981 and submitted in January 1982. The final report included three pieces of work: a study of how the Teacher Corps guidelines were implemented in the local projects, a study of the degree to which Teacher Corps practices were institutionalized in the IHEs, and a preliminary report on the characteristics and effectiveness of the staff development programs created in the Teacher Corps projects.

During the course of the evaluation, certain changes in the Teacher Corps program made it necessary for SRI to have the flexibility to adapt to the changing conditions. For example, our initial conception of the effects of a staff development program was observable behavior change on the part of the teachers. After our first round of site visits, we found that many projects did not emphasize behavior change, but rather attitude change which may or may not be apparent in the teachers' observed behavior. Because of this initial finding, we had to modify our design to reflect more what was occurring in the projects. In the summer of 1980, a new director of Teacher Corps was named, Dr. John Minor. Dr. Minor had felt that more emphasis should be given to exceptionality, multicultural, and community-based education. As a result, SRI modified some aspects of the evaluation design to be more sensitive to these issues.

Throughout the course of the evaluation, SRI monitored congressional policy concerns. One issue was repeatedly mentioned by congressional staffers, and that was whether Teacher Corps was duplicating the efforts of other education programs. In an attempt to shed light on this issue, SRI modified the interview and documentaton procedures to collect information about other education programs existing at the local site, and their relationship to the Teacher Corps project.

These adaptations to changing conditions and concerns were accomplished through a continual monitoring of evaluation issues and through interactions with the project officer, the Teacher Corps Washington staff, and the evaluation's reaction panel. Although SRI received much useful advice and many suggestions for the design of the evaluation, the results and recommendations provided in the final report are the sole responsibility of SRI and no official endorsement by any agency in the Department of Educaton is implied or should be inferred.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the assistance of the staff in the national Teacher Corps office who have given us thoughtful guidance and support throughout the study. We are especially appreciative of the help of Dr. William Smith, director of the Teacher Corps program at the time the SRI project was initiated and Dr. John Minor, who succeeded Dr. Smith as director. Special thanks are also due to Dr. Robert Maroney and Mr. Eugene Tucker from the Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation and to Ms. Jean Narayanan from the Office of Dissemination and Professional Development for their assistance and understanding in their role as technical monitors of this contract.

Our thanks also to the staff of the Education and Human Services Research Center at SRI International whose diligence and hard work made this evaluation possible. We are especially grateful to Marion Collins, Beth Hiseler, and Shelia Warrington without whose time and patience this document could not have been produced.

We are appreciative of the assistance of our two consultants, Dr. Andrew Porter and Dr. David Florio, whose insights and timely comments contributed much to this effort.

Most of all, we appreciate the active support received from the project directors and local documenters in the 132 Teacher Corp projects. They gave freely of their time, welcomed SRI into their projects, and provided insights that are the foundation of these reports. Our special thanks also extend to all school, college and community personnel in these Teacher Corps projects who contributed to this effort. Thank you.

Nicholas Stayrook
Project Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS FOR THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT STUDY

This status report on the staff development study was made possible through the help of many individuals. We especially appreciate the cooperation of the local project documenters who supplied us with valuable information in the documentation essays. We are also indebted to other local project personnel who took the time to be interviewed.

A special thanks is extended to Dr. Jane Stallings who orginally designed the staff development study, and to our consultant, Dr. Andrew Porter, who gave us valuable comments throughout the conduct of this study.

Lastly, we appreciate the support of the SRI staff in the Education and Human Services Research Center for their contributions to this study. We particularly thank Marion Collins without whose secretarial and coordinating skills this report could not have been produced.

I INTRODUCTION TO THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT STUDY IN THE TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM EVALUATION

In August 1978, SRI International was awarded a 3-year contract to conduct a national evaluation of the Teacher Corps Program. The training study proposed to describe the educational programs set up for teacher training (both preservice and inservice) and the delivery systems used to convey the content of the educational programs to the participants in the training.

During the first year of the evaluation, site visits were made to a few Teacher Corps projects and the SRI research team refined the study design. Near the end of the first year, in May 1979, a meeting of the members of a reaction panel (REAP) was held to critique the study design. Comments received during this meeting led to some revisions in the instrumentation for the training study.

During the 1979-80 school year, data collection activities occurred. These included two site visits to each sampled* Teacher Corps project, the administration of a self-report questionnaire, and the submission of documentation forms from the local Teacher Corps projects. The data collected during this time were incorporated in the interim annual report submitted to the Office of Program Evaluation in October, 1980.

---

*There were 30 Teacher Corps projects selected to be included in the basic SRI evaluation sample--20 projects from Program 78, and 10 projects from Program 79. The projects were representatively selected based on prior project Teacher Corps experience, urbanization, and dominance of the IHE/LEA.

Comments were received on the October 1980 report, and these comments suggested that substantial revisions needed to be made in the design of the training study. For example, one consultant to the evaluation felt that the information collected during 1979-80 was too highly oriented toward delivery systems, and was too highly structured (in terms of response categories) to give a representative picture of each project's staff development program.

Accordingly, the training study design was revised, and the study was renamed the staff development study. This study was designed to collect a combination of more open-ended information about staff development, and the more structured information about particular training events and the evaluation of these events. The new design gave equal weight to the content of the staff development program and to the delivery systems used to convey the content. The analyses were also reconceptualized.

The staff development study design (January, 1981) proposed to investigate all aspects of Teacher Corps training, focusing on both Program 78 and Program 79 Teacher Corps projects. The study encompassed training for interns, teachers, principals, other local school personnel, community members, and faculty from the IHE. The study was to extend to August 1983, in order to follow-up on the interns, as well as to look at the continuance of training programs and the longer term impacts of this training.

Data collection according to the new design began in the winter of 1980, and extended to April 1981. In April, 1981, the government decided to curtail the evaluation at the end of the third year (November 1981). Due to this shortened time period, a full analysis of all data collected as part of the staff development study was not able to be done.

In an effort to be responsive to the government's request for whatever information on staff development SRI could provide, this technical status report on staff development has been prepared. We report here only on the staff development of <u>teachers</u> in Program 78 Teacher Corps projects. Thus,

training in Program 79 projects, as well as all training of interns, principals, other local school personnel, community, and IHE faculty, are no longer included in the staff development study. In addition, only one of 5 sets of data is drawn upon to describe tenative findings.

This report first describes the reconceptualized staff development study that was necessary in order to narrow the task and make reporting feasible within the budget limits. We present the data sources and hypotheses related to staff development. Tentative findings based on a preliminary analysis of documentation data collected in 1980-1981 are then presented.

II DATA SOURCES AND HYPOTHESES

The staff development study centers on the professional development activities provided teachers in the Program 78 Teacher Corps projects. One of the major purposes of the Teacher Corps projects was to have local school districts and college work together to improve the professional development programs in the local schools serving children from low income families. This report reports on the characteristics and effectiveness of the staff development programs created by these Teacher Corps projects.

In this report, we will focus on four major issues:

- The impact of the federal Rules and Regulations on staff development programs.
- The implementation of staff development programs in the local schools.
- The contributions of Teacher Corps to the local education agency's (LEA's) personnel development system.
- The impacts of Teacher Corps staff development programs on the institutes of higher education (IHEs).

This section first describes the available data on staff development and our tentative hypotheses regarding effective staff development practices.

Data Sources

Data for the study of staff development come from five major sources: interviews, self-report questionnaires, demographic questionnaires, training logs, and documentation essays. The data were collected during the 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years in the 20 sampled Program 78 Teacher Corps projects*. Although the findings presented in section III are derived from the documentation essays, data from the other sources, especially the interviews, were used as a check on the findings generated from documentation. A formal analysis of these other data sources was not done due to budget constraints. We next turn to a brief discussion of these data sources.

Interviews

During the 1979-80 school year, each of the 20 sampled Program 78 Teacher Corps projects was visited twice to conduct face-to-face interviews. These interviews were designed primarily to obtain information about the staff development programs, but also included questions about school climate.

The "baseline" interview (conducted in the winter of 1979-80) examined the start up of the staff development programs. In particular, we obtained information concerning the identification of training objectives, the process of needs assessment and planning, and the type of training which had existed prior to the presence of Teacher Corps. The "training" interview (conducted in the spring of 1980) focused on describing the training offered by Teacher Corps, and the participants' initial evaluation of that training.

---

*Some of these data were collected from a greater number of projects. However, this study focuses primarily on the 20 sampled Program 78 projects.

A third site visit was made to the 20 Program 78 projects in Spring 1981 using newly developed interviews. These "implementation" interviews focused on the implementation of the training program, the participation in training, as well as the perceived effectiveness of that training.

For all three sets of interviews, individuals from seven role groups in each project responded: the project director, the team leader, three principals, six teachers, the four interns, two IHE faculty members, and the community council chairperson. The number of persons interviewed varied slightly over time because of attrition. However, we generally interviewed the same individuals on each visit to a particular project.

Self-Report Questionnaires

Self-report questionnaires were mailed to project participants on three occasions: the spring of 1980, fall of 1980, and the spring of 1981. In each project, the questionnaires were mailed to the following individuals: the project director, the team leader, the project documenter, the LEA superintendent, the dean of the IHE college of education, the four interns, four school principals, six teachers from each of four project schools (24 teachers in all), the community council chairperson, and 20% of the IHE faculty members involved in the Teacher Corps project. The respondents included all the individuals interviewed.

On the questionnaire, information was sought concerning the effectiveness of the staff development program for teachers. In addition, questions were asked about the respondents' participation in training, their satisfaction with the training, and whether they thought the Teacher Corps staff development program was an improvement over past inservice offerings.

Demographic Questionnaires

Demographic information was obtained in each Teacher Corps project from the IHE, the LEA, and the participating schools. Each of these organizations received a demographic questionnaire in early 1980. The IHE demographic items were designed to obtain general informaton on the school of education, school of education experience in teacher training, faculty population data, and student population data. The LEA demographic items obtained information on the physical size, location, and composition of all the schools in the district; the number and assignments of school and administrative personnel; student population characteristics; and prior Teacher Corps involvement. The school demographic items sought information on faculty characteristics, school population characteristics, and prior Teacher Corps involvement.

Training Logs

The training logs were a self-reporting instrument devised by SRI to enable a project to record the training events occurring in the project. Local project documenters (or a comparable person) recorded each training event on a separate form and submitted these forms on a monthly basis to SRI during the 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years. For each training event, the documenter recorded the type of training event (course, workshop, conference, etc.), the objective of the event, the identity of the trainers and the trainees, the incentives for participation, and the time and place of the event. Categories for these dimensions were prespecified, and the documenters only had to check boxes or record numbers of people. In order to verify this information, prior to the third site visit the SRI site visitors created a list of training events derived from these training logs and other sources. During the site visit, the list of training events was verified, and corrected if necessary by the Teacher Corps project director.

Documentation Essays

Local project documenters were asked to submit documentation essays to SRI on a quarterly basis during the 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years. Questions posed by SRI during Quarters 3 and 5 are directly relevant to staff development. Documentation essays from quarters 1, 2, 4, and 6 were summarized and reported in "Framework for Local Action: Lessons from Implementing the Teacher Corps Guidelines, Volumes 1 and 2," Beers, et al, January 1982.

In Quarter 3, the documentation topic was "Propositions Regarding Training/Teaching." The Rules and Regulations governing the Teacher Corps Program specify a number of key features that projects were to incorporate into the design of their activities. Four key features were identified by SRI as being directly relevant to staff development: the use of field-based and community-based training, the integration of preservice and inservice training, the use of multicultural education approaches, and the use of a diagnostic/ prescriptive teaching approach. The documenters were asked to agree or disagree with the propositions that those key features were useful for their staff development programs, and to explain their responses (Appendix A). These essays were received from the Program 78 Teacher Corps projects.

In Quarter 5, the documentation centered on the inservice training of local school teachers. Three topics were addressed: the primary focus of the inservice training system (including the objectives and goals of the inservice program), the strategy or general approach to inservice training, and how the Teacher Corps project contributed to an improved educational personnel development system (Appendix B). The last topic concerned improvements that had already taken place, rather than hoped-for or potential improvements. These essays were completed by 31 Teacher Corps projects out of 49 (both Program 78 and Program 79) sent the essay assignment. All 20 projects in the basic Program 78 sample (described previously) were sent this essay assignment.

Hypotheses

The evaluation of Teacher Corps staff development programs and the creation of the documentation essay assignments were guided by hypotheses concerning effective approaches to staff development and the improvement of educational personnel development systems. The hypotheses guiding this study were derived from three sources. First, the Rules and Regulations governing the Teacher Corps Program have been viewed by the SRI evaluation team as a strategy for the implementation of a Teacher Corps project. Specific key features in these Rules and Regulations can be seen as tactics within the overall strategy. Four of the key features (mentioned earlier in the discussion of the Quarter 3 documentation essay) pertain directly to staff development programs. Our hypothesis regarding these key features is that implementation of these four key features will lead to an improved educational personnel development system; this improvement is one of the basic outcomes to be achieved by a Teacher Corps project. Furthermore, it is hypothesized that the better these features are implemented, the more improved the staff development program will be.

A second source of hypotheses is literature on the inservice training of teachers. A primary source was a collection of writings on inservice training of teachers edited by Louis Rubin (1978), entitled The Inservice Education of Teachers. Two articles were particularly useful for hypothesis generation. The first is by Charles Speiker entitled "Do Staff Development Practices Make a Difference?" (Rubin, 1978). Speiker reviews research on staff development and makes statements about practices associated with effective staff development programs. These statements can be viewed as hypotheses to be verified in the study of Teacher Corps. Some examples of these hypotheses include:

- More effective staff development programs have differentiated training for different teachers (i.e. individualized programs)
- More effective staff development programs put the teacher in an "active" role (constructing and generating materials, ideas and behaviors).

- More effective staff development programs emphasize demonstrations, supervised trials, and feedback, rather than expecting teachers to store up ideas for future use.

- More effective staff development programs have the teachers choose goals and activities for themselves rather than having goals and activities prescribed for them.

In another article entitled "Some Postulates and Principles on the Continuing Professional Education of Teachers" (Rubin, 1978), Rubin lists 87 postulates and principles he believes to be important in staff development. Some of these are not able to be tested; however, many of these can be addressed within the context of SRI's evaluation of Teacher Corps. Stated in terms of hypotheses to be tested, some examples are:

- More effective staff development programs make use of actual teaching situations involving students.

- More effective staff development programs give teachers feedback on their professional growth.

- More effective staff development programs allow teachers the opportunity to practice new skills in their regular teaching.

- More effective staff development programs have teachers participate in the governance of their own professional growth.

A third source of hypotheses is SRI staff experiences in evaluating the Teacher Corps Program. These hypotheses were derived from site visits in Teacher Corps projects and from discussions with the Teacher Corps project staff, most notably the project directors. Some of these hypotheses include:

- The more that projects conduct needs assessments and direct training efforts at the school building-level (instead of district-wide), the higher the participation in staff development programs.

- The more that training activities are conducted in the teacher's workplace (i.e. the classroom), the higher the ratings of usefulness and satisfaction.

- The more that training activities are individualized and include follow-up sessions to see that the recommendations are being used correctly, the more likely that teachers will rate the activities useful.

- The more that staff development programs have the active support of the school principal, the higher the participation and satisfaction of teachers.

- The more that staff development programs create school-level planning committees which include teachers, the principal and other school personnel, the greater the participation and ratings of satisfaction.

- The more that Teacher Corps project directors are visible in the schools and act as "resource brokers" (i.e., they identify resources at the IHE that fit with the needs of the local schools), the more easily staff development programs are established, and the more effective the programs.

The next section discusses preliminary findings based on the documentation essays. These findings relate mainly to the hypotheses generated from the Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations.

III TENTATIVE FINDINGS

The findings included in this technical status report must be considered tentative at this time. Analyses of all the data sources listed in the previous section are not completed; however, one data source, the documentation essays, has been summarized. Findings presented in this section are derived from the documentation essays.* The Quarter 3 documentation essays address hypotheses that pertain to the key features in the Rules and Regulations (See Appendix A). The Quarter 5 documentation essays provide findings on the contributions of Teacher Corps to an improved educational professional development system (See Appendix B).

Quarter 3 Documentation

The following summary reflects the major themes in Quarter 3 documentation essays, written by documenters in Program 78 projects toward the end of the projects' first operational year (second year of project grant). Essays were due May 31, 1980; most were written in May or June.

Though ostensibly about the effectiveness of four key features of the Rules and Regulations as "implementation tactics," the essays are more usefully regarded as statements about the way each provision was

---

*These essays included information on the training of teachers, interns, and other personnel. These preliminary analyses do not separate out the training of teachers from other training.

interpreted, and the basis for its perceived value to the project. This summary is consequently organized around these dimensions. The four features include:

(1) Field-based and community-based training
(2) Integrated preservice and inservice training
(3) Training in multicultural education
(4) Training in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching.

These four features can be grouped into two sets, those dealing with the training process or strategy (1 & 2) and those dealing with the subject focus of training (3 & 4). A fifth key feature--the teacher-intern team--was not listed in the essay assignment, but frequently alluded to in the essays. Patterns relating to the intern team are included in the process section.

Of the 79 Program 78 projects, 54 returned essays for Quarter 3--in other words, an overall response rate of 68%. A check of responding projects by category of project (that is, as defined by major design variables) indicated little obvious distortion due to systematic nonresponse (see Table 1). Between three-fifths and four-fifths of most project categories responded, with the exception of Youth Advocacy projects that were underrepresented and Beginning Rural projects that were completely represented.

Table 1

QUARTER 3 ESSAY: PROGRAM 78 RESPONSE RATES

[By Design Variable]

Regular Projects (Including Projects With Incomplete Feeder Systems)

	Beginning	Continuing
Rural	100%* (5)	71%* (7)
Semiurban	71% (7)	75% (8)
Urban	60% (5)	67% (27)

Special Projects

Youth Advocacy		38% (8)
Native American		71% (7)
Outside U.S.		80% (5)

*Cell % responding; number in parentheses is total cell n.

General Policy Findings

Certain themes running through this essay set pertain to issues of policy potentially addressed by the study. These themes and issues will be briefly summarized here. Documentary evidence for these assertions appear later in the summary. However, some of what follows is speculative; the essays of this set are far from providing convincing evidence on any of the issues. Other data sources will be required to substantiate these assertions more fully.

1. How flexible are the Rules and Regulations pertaining to training process and content? Do they successfully balance guidance with respect for local differences and interests? The four key features of the Rules and Regulations discussed in these essays were given a wide range of meanings by different projects. While noting the ambiguity, few projects advocated clearer federal definitions of the four requirements, although help was sometimes wanted to aid the process of defining or implementing them (for example, multicultural education). The ambiguity of language appears to have produced a healthy range of interpretations and local efforts.

2. Do the training process and content provisions of the Rules and Regulations contradict one another or get in each other's way? This is not so in principle, but in some cases this appears to have happened, to the extent that field-based training emphasizing locally defined needs may have led to deemphasis on multicultural education or diagnostic/prescriptive teaching, because there were no clear local priorities. More often than not, however, these were local priorities (probably a selection effect of the competitive grants process, in part). Projects seem to have resolved any inconsistencies by strategically ignoring or meeting content requirements in a pro forma way (for example, one workshop on a multicultural topic).

3. How important or valuable are the four training requirements across the full range of projects, as seen from the projects' point of view?

(a) Field-based and Community-based Training

Depending on how these two terms were defined, they were generally seen as very important, because of increased access to training opportunities (especially important in rural sites), training focused more on problems of practical teaching and specific schools, and training that took account of the way teachers grew and learned. Projects tended to value community-based training less consistently and struggled more to define the concept. Though there were striking examples of apparently effective community-based training, there was much reported frustration, more so where the requirement was interpreted to mean community education, and less so where the term meant a field setting for intern training.

(b) Integrated Preservice and Inservice Training

This concept was more difficult for most projects to translate into action than the field-based training requirement. Narrower interpretations included side-by-side participation of interns and inservice teachers in workshops or, in some cases, in the intern program itself. Such projects appeared to value integrated rearrangements more for their contribution to interns' field experience than for anything else. In other projects, where integral arrangements were defined as a process of "mutual learning" through extensive interaction between interns and inservice teachers, the requirement was highly valued. Many projects noted the substantial differences in preservice and inservice training needs, while asserting that long-range improvements in the IHE approaches to both might result from project efforts.

(c) Training in Multicultural Education

This appears to be a particularly elusive, difficult and emotion-charged concept to translate into action, but many projects appear to value it highly, at least rhetorically. The requirement seemed to be more vigorously implemented and valued in culturally diverse projects or in those with a strong nonmainstream cultural tradition (for example, in Native American projects). A number of projects expressed the need for outside assistance in this area.

(d) Training in Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching Approaches

Reflecting divisions among professional educators, projects interpreted this requirement either in behavioristic terms (that is, a clinical competency-based approach) or more humanistic terms (that is, oriented towards individual learner differences). While there was general support for the idea, defined in either way, many practical difficulties were noted, especially in those projects emphasizing elaborate record-keeping and diagnostic testing. The experience of projects to date raises certain questions about the feasibility of the requirement, despite some strong examples of effective application.

4. What do the essays indicate regarding the federal role as guide or support for implementation efforts in these areas? The essays say relatively little about this question, nor were documenters asked directly about this. Reading between the lines, there were periodic calls for a federal support role, especially with reference to multicultural education.

Training Process and Strategy Findings

The Rules and Regulations required projects to design training that was "primarily field-based and carried out in the community served by the project", and involved "the provision of preservice and inservice training as an integral process" within an improved educational personnel development system. Projects interpreted these requirements in remarkably different ways. In a sense, the meaning attributed to each determined to a degree the value projects found in each requirement and the nature of problems they encountered. In many projects, "field-based" and "community-based" training were considered to be separate requirements and will be discussed separately below. In other cases, documenters wrote about field-based and community-based training as one thing, implying (or stating) that the low-income community was an added dimension to the field setting.

Field-Based Training

The Meanings of Field-Based Training--The meanings of field-based training fall on a continuum between those projects in which little changed in the IHE's approach to training except the location and those in which the new locus of training activities reflected profound differences in content, attitudes, and manner of delivering training. At the one end of the continuum in places where only the location of training changed, documenters stressed the convenience and access to training--no small matter in many of the rural sites--as seen in the following excerpt from a rural site in the south:*

> Our project site is in a rural community and with the price of gasoline skyrocketing, it is difficult for interested persons to travel 45 miles to the university. It has been convenient in terms of time; teachers and interns could leave one classroom

*All essay excerpts have been edited to preserve project anonymity.

where they teach children and go to another classroom where a professor is waiting to teach the teachers. We have also gained released time for teacher aides to attend a workshop within the school with consultants from the IHE.

A large portion of projects, approximately a third, mentioned this aspect of field-based training. But changing the location could often carry with it other meanings, not necessarily apparent to the trainers when they started their activities. From an urban project in the Midwest, the documenter noted:

> We simply moved the training environment from the university setting into the public schools.
>
> I have identified the following attributes that resulted from this environmental change
>
> (1) Holding classes in the public schools rather than at the university made it more convenient for teachers and community representatives to attend. The classes are held at times identified by participants as being most convenient, usually 4:00 to 7:00 p.m.
>
> (2) The change in environment also removed the instructor from his/her "turf," which appeared to have postive effects on their relationships with students. They tended to be more flexible and responsive to the needs of the students.
>
> (3) Although the class enrollment was diversified, including elementary and secondary teachers, community representatives and preservice interns, there was also homogeneity in that all participants were involved in the Teacher Corps project. This tended to create group security and assertiveness in forcing the instructor to respond to the expressed needs of the students. The results appeared to reflect a practical application of the course content.

The subtle changes in attitude of instructors and the practical orientation of training reflected important shifts in the IHE approach.

The second meaning of field-based training was that it took locally expressed problems and needs as the organizing principle for training activities. The most common form of this involved elaborate needs assessment surveys during the developmental year as the basis for planning

and offering university courses tailored to local needs, as described by a documenter in a project in a western city:

> From the outset of our project, field-based has characterized our educational development system. During Year 1, the Inservice Council, two-thirds of whom were district and community personnel, canvassed teachers and administrators at the four target schools to determine their perceived needs for staff development. Based on this survey, the ISC planned three courses for staff development.
>
> During Year 2, course participants and university instructors planned specific activities within the ISC planning framework. Each class session was evaluated by participants for relevancy of objectives, attainment of objectives, and degree of involvement. As new needs and interests were revealed by this feedback, courses were modified. During the spring quarter of this second year (1979-80), about 40 people were involved, primarily from the target schools. General feedback has indicated that course participants feel that they "own" the courses.

A third meaning of field-based training, suggested by a few essays, referred more to the process by which teachers learned, especially with reference to the interns. One project spoke of the field-based training as a necessary component of any training:

> ...By taking participants from a level of awareness to a level of application and problem solving, experiential learning is a goal for teaching in our project.... It must be molded. It is understanding at a high level.

Direct experience of school conditions immersed interns in the practical reality of teaching low-income students. However, the experience was not necessarily positive for all trainees and as a consequence could be seen as a mixed blessing. One documenter, whose project operated in a large, urban setting in the Northeast, explained how:

> Some interns, for example, had difficulty accepting some school conditions and teacher styles, and at least one of them found coursework at the college more beneficial this first year. It is possible that interns may assess their early experiences

differently at a later stage in their programs. The transition from student status (usually accompanied by feelings of identification with children) to teacher status (and identification with educators working out difficulties in a complex setting) is neither an easy nor a quick one. It is even possible that a placement in a different setting would serve a comparative purpose. Such a possibility widens the interpretation of field-based training, but in no way negates the idea that effectiveness is enhanced by learning based on experiences in the reality of the school and community.

Obviously, the language of the Rules and Regulations left considerable room for the interpretation of field-based training. Some projects felt that this ambiguity was counterproductive, as suggested by the following observation of a documenter in an extracontinental U.S. project:

> Depending on the point of view of persons in decisionmaking positions, field-basedness can mean anything from regular college courses given by regular instructors who simply meet with the class in a classroom in the public schools to user-initiated and user-driven programs which are developed by the participants to meet their perceived needs without any guidelines or requirements from institutions of higher education. Most definitions fall somewhere between these two. While some flexibility is necessary in order to fit comfortably into local situations, the regulations need to be more explicit in precisely what is meant by field-based and community-based training. Even literature disseminated is contradictory. If those who develop regulations know what they mean, they should tell us. If they don't, they need to develop a definition soon.

However, this view appears to reflect a minority view. The rich variety of interpretations, apparently suited to diverse local conditions, seems to be a productive outcome in most cases of local initiative interacting with a flexible federal mandate.

The Value of Field-Based Training--As most of the preceding essay excerpts suggest, the notion of basing training activity in the field, however defined, was highly valued by most projects. (Self-selection and the competitive grant process have, no doubt, contributed much to this fact.) But projects varied with respect to the kinds of value they found in this feature of the program.

Depending on the meaning given field-based training, different benefits were thought to result: (1) In those cases where altered location of IHE services was the primary meaning, convenience and access were stressed, and a number of projects cited increased attendance; (2) In those cases where building the content of training around local needs was stressed, training was thought to encourage practical application as well as the solution of particular educational problems in project schools; and (3) Those projects with more of a focus on the experiential learning process tended to emphasize teachers' growth and the superior way in which teaching skills become internalized.

The value of field-based training depends as well on who experiences the benefits. Essays suggest different kinds of benefits for various role groups. Although in principle all role groups could benefit from field-based approaches, essays tended to single out one or another.

First, from the point of view of inservice teachers, training opportunities came to them, as well as increased resources for handling the many problems they faced in their everyday teaching. For some, especially those in isolated settings, the increased feasibility of improving credentials was a positive value. A two-sided process of commitment seemed to characterize those. Clearly, where teachers were involved in planning inservice activities, or at least contributed to designing them through needs assessment processes, there was often an increased sense of "ownership" on the teachers' part. Many essays referred to this but alongside this was an increased belief on the part of teachers that the IHE training personnel would (or could) listen to their needs and had something to offer. One documenter from a southern Youth Advocacy project noted this, and the fact that such credibility comes slowly:

> The educational community is only now beginning to realize the intense needs for proximity and involvement with the clients who are to be trained. In addition, the realization that the task is expanding in need, scope, and sequence is becoming obvious. Thus, we need everyone. But we must also be patient enough to remain in

> the field until our clients believe us, though costly it may sometimes seem--initially. We should not place ourselves in the midst of our clients, only to be recalled when the numbers do not swell--"in a hurry" (as was the case in this project). Patience and determination are musts. It takes time--I think--for our clients (and potential clients) to believe that we want to be field-based...and that we are truly there in a supportive and collegial stance.

Second, from the point of view of preservice trainees (interns), the field-based approach was generally described as an excellent opportunity for interns to prepare for the practical craft of teaching, in addition to becoming sensitive to the kinds of communities in which they were teaching. One documenter in an eastern, urban project captured the spirit of many essays well:

> The interns profit immensely from the field-based and community-based training that they receive. They have participated in a wide variety of educational experiences in a real school setting over an extended period of time. They have worked in the community and with community parents in the schools; they have learned to view the community as a resource to be utilized to improve education, not as an impediment. It is apparent to me that the unique opportunities available in field-based and community training received by the interns have made them more effective and sensitive teachers at this early stage of their professional careers than they would otherwise have been.

Third, from the point of view of low-income schools and the communities they serve, field-based training strategies were seen to have promise, by the few documenters who chose to comment on this. This made training oriented toward local needs, and concentrated professional and community resources on school problems. As one documenter in a southern project put it:

> Even more important, under the field-based, community-based approach to education, professional and lay people work together to solve local problems and from their combined effort, a sense of mutual respect and understanding grows. Problems are grappled with by many people, each of whom possessed varied talents and abilities. And under these circumstances, solutions are much more likely to be found and implemented. One example of which our project is particularly proud is our program development teams.

> Each site-school has a PDT which consists of the LEA principal, Teacher Corps site coordinator, a professor from the IHE and three community council members. Reacting to the individual needs of each school, the PDT seeks solutions to problems within the school and strives to improve the overall school climate and curriculum.

Fourth, from the point of view of the IHE, the adoption of field-based strategies was perceived to leave varying benefits, ranging from strengthening the link between theory and practice to the subtler "sense of mutual respect" referred to in the preceding quote. Implied by many essays and stated by a few, the sense of mutual respect was often missing and constituted a major implementation problem facing field-based training, as one documenter in a Native American project explained:

> In reality they are still desirable but to a lesser degree effective as implementation tactics because of the sometimes thorny problems besetting implementation. A common reaction from "ivory tower" professors is that courses must be watered down, changed, and that library and research materials are unavailable in the field. They complain that inservice teachers miss more of their classes (for usually legitimate reasons) as a result of job and family demands than do regular on-campus students. Professors feel that inservice teachers want a preponderance of nitty gritty, "what to do on Monday morning" and dislike "wasting," as teachers see it, their time on theories. Readers of transcripts see 'extension or continuing education' credit beside a course and tend to discount its value compared with an on-campus class or resident class for basically the reasons stated above.
>
> On the flip side of the coin, teacher reaction is sometimes negative saying that the courses and professors are rather rigid and unable to adapt to a different situation and set of student needs. They feel the professors dwell too much on theories and spend too little time addressing the pragmatic areas of actual instruction.

The IHEs' fears of lowering standards through field-based training was apparent in many cases and presented projects with a major challenge to their legitimacy. But the capacity of field-based approaches to alter these perceptions appears to be considerable, especially from the IHEs' point of view. A number of essays reported changes such as the following from a documenter in a large, northeastern, urban project:

> We have found that bringing the instructors to the schools has been effective in modifying both the instructors' attitude and our organization.

This was echoed by a previously cited comment from a project located in a small, midwestern city:

> ...The change in environment also removed the instructors from their "turf," which appeared to have a positive effect on their relationships with students. They tended to be more flexible and responsive to the needs of the students.

Whether these perceived values are lasting, or reflect demonstrable outcomes (as opposed to hoped-for effects), can be debated. The answer lies beyond the scope of this essay assignment and requires assembling a larger array of evidence from different points in time.

Community-Based Training

Where it was distinguished from field-based training, the community-based training requirement generated more confusion and less consistent support, as expressed in Quarter 3 essays.

The Meanings of Community-Based Training--Once again, projects interpreted the language and intent of the Rules and Regulations differently. A number had trouble with the diffuseness of the concept, so much so that a viable definition of community-based training failed to crystallize, typified by the following documenter's remarks from a Native American project:

> As to community-based training, plans seem to be constantly developing but somehow only a very few are ever implemented. Probably the main reason for this is the more nebulous "structure" of the community as opposed to the clearer structure of the school. Another possible contributor to the lack of implementation could be the generality of proposal guidelines in regard to community-based education.

Four fundamentally different meanings for community-based training emerge from the essays. These meanings fall into two groups, those aimed at community members as the recipients of training or education, and those with direct input into the inservice and preservice training process itself. First and most common, projects such as the one cited above interpreted the phrase to mean training for community members--typically the community council members, so that they could function more effectively as program participants.

A second broader version of community training, verging on what might be called community education, appeared in a number of projects in the form of community involvement seminars or other events aimed at community problems or a strengthened role for community members in the schools. The following excerpt, from an essay about a project located in an eastern city, typified approaches tried in both urban and rural settings:

> The community, also, in its training class at a local site, features eminently practical, useful instruction. Members of the community learn how to have a real and positive impact on their children's education and the quality of the local schools. For instance, they have met with the school principals and district policymakers to elicit specific information on how decisions are made that affect their children's education. Further, they have received training in how to be assertive, but not threatening, in conveying their concerns to school leaders and in seeking change.

A number of projects designed training sequences to provide community members with tutoring (or other) skills so that they might help more directly in the schools.

A third meaning, again very commonly found in essays, took community-based training to refer to substantial community input into the planning and design of inservice or preservice teacher training activities. Although Quarter 3 essays do not deal comprehensively with the matter, they suggest that in some projects community members had considerable input into training program design. One Native American project in a rural setting indicated as such:

> If community-based training means to involve the members of the community in the decisionmaking processes of the program, and to make use of community resources in the curriculum, then we can agree without qualification [that community-based training is an effective implementation tactic]. This has been an important aspect of our project since its inception in 1970 and has provided the strength which has made it possible for the program to survive several political and institutional battles through the years.

However, patterns from other essay assignments suggest that more typically, community members played a relatively minor role in project decisionmaking, despite good intentions and rhetoric to the contrary.

A fourth meaning of community-based training emphasized the community as a setting and resource for the field-based training of teachers. This most often took the form of community activities or experiences for interns, as suggested by the following quote, which represents only one of many kinds of community experiences for interns:

> The interns learned about language development during special training and continued their learning by visiting on a regular basis in the homes of 4 year olds sharing their knowledge and repertoire of activities with the parents, and exploring the use of these in sessions with the children.

The community was rarely described as an important resource or base for inservice training; however, some writers intimated that the gap between school and community needed to be bridged.

These four meanings did not necessarily exclude one another. A few ambitious projects tried to put together community-based training of all these kinds simultaneously. For example, a southwestern, urban project listed the following kinds of activities as community-based training:

> The LEA is participating in community-based training activities through: (1) community involvement seminars (CIS), (2) intern training, (3) neighborhood analysis, and (4) field-based professional development options (modules). The community component is participating in field-based and community-based programs through: (1) community involvement seminars, (2) the Professional Development Center, (3) neighborhood analysis, (4) parent and community volunteer programs, and (5) the Parent Tutoring Program.

The Value of Community-Based Training--Perceptions of the value of this requirement spanned a range from those who questioned its worth to those who found it essential. Judgments were colored considerably by the degree to which problems had been encountered, and these of course reflected the interpretations given the community-based training requirement. If nothing else, essays are testimony to the difficulty of achieving meaningful community-based training by any definition.

A few strong dissenting voices, reflecting the difficulties of sustaining community/parent participation, found the requirement unimportant, as was observed by a documenter of a project in a large, western city:

> Community-based education is a current educational fad, that like many others, will leave little behind when it passes.
>
> Perhaps the locality of our Teacher Corps project is unique, but we find few parents are interested in deep involvement with the issues of Teacher Corps and the schools. This is not to say they are unconcerned with education or their children. They are, but in concrete and specific ways. Attempts to involve them in the broader issues and critical needs of education have been largely fruitless. In other words, they are interested in Susie and whether or not Mrs. Cooper seems to be a good teacher for her. They are not interested in integrating preservice and inservice. We have sponsored community forum series of our community council, featuring speakers such as the superintendent of the school district and the president of the college, the supervisors for curriculum in elementary and secondary, the new president of the school board. In spite of the considerable efforts and expertise of our community council coordinator, who has an M.A. in community education, rarely do more than three or four persons attend.
>
> The four basic outcomes of Teacher Corps remain abstractions to most members of the community council committee. This had a very negative effect when the budget was cut. Many community members wished to retain peripheral programs, while cutting back those essential ones that support the Teacher Corps outcomes. During this process, it was clear they did not see themselves as collaborators to achieve the basic goals, but rather watchdogs over the budget. Unfortunately, this stance has been encouraged by some speakers heard by community council members at national or regional meetings.

But others were as adamant about the importance of such efforts and met with less frustrating results. In particular, a number of projects indicated that training efforts directed at community members had strengthened community leadership and presence in schools. One documenter in a southern, rural site observed that:

> The community school program broke the precedent of community peoples not feeling comfortable in the schools. Interaction between parents and teachers has increased as a result of a community-based education program. Many community members are now working as volunteers in the schools.

This kind of effect, and the assumed value of it, was especially prevalent in rural communities. A documenter in another southern, rural site, pointed to potential strengths in rural communities, which permitted community training to bear fruit:

> The setting--a small rural community--makes collaboration possible, which results in desirable behavior. Collaboration is possibly more useful because of three features of the small community, namely:
>
> (1) Key community leaders are easily identified.
>
> (2) Mobilization of community resources reveals unusual talents.
>
> (3) Trainees quickly recognize that community organization is essentially a problem-solving process.
>
> Teacher Corps project staff accepts every challenge for motivating wider community participation by implementing projects designed to raise the level of learning and living in the community. To develop a concept, increase one's knowledge, and actually perform a new skill provide the nucleus for field-based and community-based training.

In those projects that defined community-based training in terms of the interns' learning experience, the value of the experience was clearly stated, as in the previously cited passage in the discussion of field-based training.

Integrated Preservice and Inservice Training

Essays shed much light on the ways projects interpreted the integrated preservice/inservice requirement, and suggested that it, too, benefited role groups differentially. The difficulty of realizing this requirement was noted by many documenters; this was often attributed to the great differences in the training needs of preservice and inservice teachers.

The Meanings of Integrated Preservice and Inservice Training--The essays leave one with the impression that projects struggled harder, and less successfully, with this requirement, than with the field-based training mandate. Two dimensions underlay the various interpretations of the requirement: the first had to do with the interaction between the two categories of trainees, the second with the training course content. As in the case of field-based training, meanings spanned a continuum, one end that represented little change from traditional training practices and the other considerable departure.

A common interpretation, reflecting little change, meant simply that interns and inservice teachers sat together in the same set of workshops, courses, or whatever. "Integration" was clearly minimal in this kind of case: the two groups interacted very little and took away from the training events whatever they learned from the instructor or group discussion. Such events typically were designed to present to trainees practical methods and materials, as indicated by the following documenter's description of events in a midwestern, urban project:

> As I understand it, the purpose of combining preservice and inservice training is to force the training designers to develop learning experiences that meet the practical needs of the inservice teacher and the introductory needs of the preservice professional.... In our project we found the most effective integration of preservice and inservice training occurred in the workshops designed to demonstrate or model specific methods, materials, or instructional management procedures. Modifying traditional college courses to the extent necessary to accommodate preservice and inservice participants is much more difficult.

The passage alludes to some of the IHE resistance to this kind of integration. Other documenters were more explicit about it, as the following documenter in a southwestern, urban project articulated:

> The difficulty in establishing an integrated teacher training program has an historical basis. There is a history of a lack of communication and cooperation between the local IHE and LEA, which is founded on the belief that the IHE and LEA are fulfilling different functions and serve different needs. This belief importantly affects the prospects for institutionalizing a cooperatively designed continuum of professional development opportunities.
>
> The IHE and LEA view their roles in teacher training as significantly different. The IHE acknowledges its role in providing a liberal arts education coupled with the basic certification requirements required by this state. Changing classroom needs and changing teaching strategies have been historically slow to affect programming at the IHE. Until the state certification requirements are changed to reflect changing educational needs and strategies, there is subsequently little emphasis in preservicing plans for dealing with contemporary issues and problems. The responsibility of the LEA has historically been to fill this knowledge and skill gap. It becomes the LEA's responsibility to provide inservicing at the district and building level which is responsive to these changing needs. These needs have been identified by state mandates and not by local teachers' perceived inservicing needs.
>
> ...Since the IHE and LEA have historically functioned separately in teacher training, integration will not occur overnight, in one year, nor probably during the 5-year Teacher Corps funding cycle.

The separation begins to break down in those projects that define integrated preservice/inservice training in terms of a more extensive interaction between preservice trainee and inservice teacher, and in terms of a continuum of professional development opportunities. Some projects moved in this direction, but chose to see the integration as happening only within the intern program itself. In other words, interns received a balanced training program combining preservice training along fairly traditional lines and inservice experience, as practicing teachers in schools. A documenter in a rural, northeastern project explained:

> The way we are interpreting this tactic, at least in part, is to consider the intern program as an integration of inservice and preservice training approaches and to use the intern program as a model for revising the inservice and preservice programs at the IHE.

Such projects often set up intern-master teacher arrangements, in which regular teachers had a considerable part in training the interns.

But interns could potentially play many roles within schools and consequently had many opportunities for interaction with inservice teachers. In a number of projects, interns appeared to be seen more as a "junior colleague" than a "student teacher." Their relationships were consequently more mutual, and in such cases, integration of preservice/inservice training meant a more mutual learning process, in which each group gained from extensive contact with members of the other group.

In a southern rural project, the process of mutual learning worked in subtle ways, as described by the documenter:

> Our experience has shown that teachers, administrators, and others charged with the responsibility for providing the schooling experiences are often deficient in many skills.... The combining of inservice and preservice training approaches reduces the stigma of "remediation" while affording the opportunities for developing needed skills. The use of on-the-job training approaches has proved to be a viable approach to developing skills in industry and education. Thus, individuals who are classified as preservice have an increased opportunity to develop the necessary skills for good teaching. The opportunity for sharing experiences between individuals of long-term experience (inservice teachers) and individuals "fresh off the block" (preservice) is invaluable. The interns have theoretical experiences that the inservice teachers may not possess, but the inservice teachers have multitudes of experience.
>
> An example of how effective this approach is can be drawn from the experience of our interns in the kindergarten program. The kindergarten teachers at the project schools were having difficulty in training the parents of their children in providing experiences at home that would be beneficial to their children in accomplishing the objectives of the kindergarten program. All interns had had training in conducting parenting activities. The

> interns were able to demonstrate the techniques of conducting parenting seminars to the teachers. The interns, however, had never had any experience with discussing student problems with parents. The teachers provided experiences for the interns which increased competence in dealing effectively with parents. Thus, all groups (teachers, interns, parents, children) benefited.

This kind of experience was reiterated across a number of projects. Often a range of collaborative activities undertaken by interns and inservice trainees outside of formal training activities was thought to constitute integrated training. The following list of activities from a rural, mid-Atlantic site was typical of many projects:

- School administrators and classroom teachers worked together with the project staff and interns on clarification of roles and responsibilities of interns, the team leader, and the cooperating teacher. This information will be included in a management handbook for an internship program.

- A committee of classroom teachers worked with the team leader on teacher competency recommendations for the interns' preservice training. This information will be included in a project preservice training handbook.

- Interns, school personnel, and project staff worked together on the development of an informal reading inventory during the 2-week summer workshop. This IRI was used systemwide as one of the reading assessment tools at the beginning of the 1979-80 school year.

- School personnel, teacher interns, and project staff have worked together in all of the inservice training experiences--those designed to meet systemwide needs, as well as individual school needs.

- Cooperating classroom teachers have contributed as team members to the development of intern competencies and evaluation of intern progress.

Underlying the many kinds of interaction between interns and inservice teachers just described was a reconceptualization of "teacher training." Articulated by documenters in a few projects, this meaning of integrated preservice/inservice training referred more to the content and concept of traditional training courses, either those aimed at preservice trainees or inservice trainees. One documenter from a mid-central, rural project captured the spirit of several projects well in the following excerpt:

> Teacher preparation has usually consisted of a series of courses and a brief student teaching period, which comprise a program of study for students aspiring to be teachers. The program of study is developed and provided by the university and approved by the state department of education. Upon graduation, however, the newly certified teacher discovers that coursework needed for advancement in rank is still controlled by the university, while other forms of inservice, usually a specific number of days allotted in the school calendar, are conducted by the local school system.
>
> Unfortunately, time and time again such an approach has not proved successful. The most common complaint among inexperienced teachers is that they were not adequately prepared for the real world of teaching. They know their subject area well, but applying that knowledge and effectively using what they have learned--that they were never really taught to do. Experienced teachers, on the other hand, complain that on-campus graduate work fails to catch the vision of their needs and problems, and consequently, most college classes remain isolated learning experiences. Equally frustrating is the fragmented inservice offered by many school districts. Often teachers receive 1 or 2 days of training on a variety of topics in which they have no say and very little interest. Here, too, the complaint is heard that the inservice does not respond to their needs, nor does it correlate with what they are learning oncampus.
>
> For these reasons, our project believes that a well-integrated preservice and inservice program is necessary if the gap between preparation and work, between theory and practice is to be bridged.

Ultimately, such a basic reconceptualization meant a kind of institutional integration, joining the efforts of IHE and LEA to develop effective teachers across the full span of teachers' careers. A few projects apparently recognized this, at the same time accepting that this kind of integration was not easy to realize, as suggested by a previously cited quote.

The Value of Integrated Preservice/Inservice Training--Depending on how the requirement was interpreted, and also the role group thought to benefit from it, integration of preservice and inservice training had varying values across projects. However, both those who valued the requirement highly and

those who found it less worthwhile spoke of the difficulty of achieving it. Many projects spoke about the differing needs of preservice and inservice trainees and noted the difficulty of accommodating both within a single training program. In one mid-Atlantic, urban project, the documentation tempered a very positive view of the integration requirement in the following way:

> It is not always easy to conceive of appropriate activities to involve both groups, however, as their interests may diverge widely. What the interns require may be too basic for the regular staff; the "fine tuning" of skills required by the latter group may be too subtle for the interns.
>
> Nonetheless, the obstacles are not insurmountable, and we have found the integration of preservice and inservice training with teachers (and also with the community for that matter) to be a training tactic of considerable potential. Such integration establishes a symbiotic relationship among the participant groups, in which one benefits from the other and all interact to enhance the quality of the final educational product.

A counterposition, advanced by a documenter in a western, urban project, complained about the difficulty of making the "symbiotic relationship" a reality:

> The notion that preservice and inservice training should be integrated (whatever that means--Teacher Corps appears to be excessively fond of using undefined jargon terms) appears to be an attempt to rationalize the retention of the internship.
>
> The internship itself causes problems for projects. First, a healthy percentage of project money is spent (on stipends, team leader salary, college fees, etc.) to provide training for only four persons. Second, these persons are subject to a heavy academic load which is not appropriate to the needs (either objective or felt) of inservice teachers. Their time for integrated training activities is thus rather small. Third, interns' career goals are focused on attainment of the credentials necessary to get jobs. Then, they make the nonintegrated (academic) portion of their training their top priority. To attend very many training sessions for teachers tends to dissipate their energies. The degree of integration of training, in this sense, must be limited in the best interests of the interns. Further, having interns and teachers attend classes together does not appear to produce synergistic effects that might enhance learning.

> On the other hand, in certain instances collaboration between interns and other project role groups has proven fruitful. For example, the interns helped with the planning and implementation of a series of parent involvement workshops. This more general sort of collaboration, however, says nothing about the utility of integration of preservice and inservice training.

Negative views of the integration requirement were expressed only by a minority of projects and are hard to disentangle, as the previous quote illustrates, from questions raised about the intern component per se. Other factors contributed to a negative view as well, for example, the primary orientation toward preservice preparation in one Native American project.

More typically, documenters expressed reservations, asserting that integrated preservice/inservice training had some value in a limited role in the preservice field component. Thus, from the point of view of the preservice trainee (assuming that it made sense to have such people in the first place), many projects appeared to support more expanded field experiences and more varied interchange with inservice teachers. As one documenter from a western, semiurban project observed:

> The combining of the preservice training with on-the-job training quickly takes all theory to the practical level. This also gives the interns an opportunity to use and evaluate their newly acquired skills.

The theme of the rich and varied practical experience reiterated points made by many essays, as they discussed the value of field-based training for interns.

Documenters less often addressed how integrated preservice/inservice training benefited the inservice teacher. A common perception was that by interacting with interns, regular teachers were exposed to new ideas and fresh enthusiasm. This was especially true of projects that defined the requirement as a mutual learning process. One documenter in an eastern, urban project put it clearly in a way that speaks for the experience of many other projects:

> The experienced teachers, in turn, benefit from the fresh perspective and new ideas that the interns bring to teaching. In assisting the new teachers, the experienced ones are forced to repeatedly articulate, and often to reassess, their ideas on various teaching practices, and this becomes a valuable professional growth experience for them. In our project we have found the integration of preservice and inservice training to be an effective implementation tactic, for the above-described reasons.

The excerpt highlights a self-evaluation process, as inservice teachers interacted with preservice trainees.

From the point of view of the IHE and LEA, the value of an integral training approach was described as more long term, more related to the age-old challenge of bridging the theory-practice gap and historical separation between institutions. Here it is hard to distinguish rhetorical support for the idea of integral preservice/inservice training from support based on demonstrated achievement. This kind of question is better addressed by data from later points in time.

Training Program Content Findings

The Rules and Regulations required projects to "improve the competency of all educational personnel employed by the project schools (including teacher-interns) to provide education that is multicultural" and to provide the same personnel "the opportunity to improve their competency to identify children with learning and behavioral problems, diagnose the special needs of such children, and prescribe learning activities to meet those needs". Essay commentary on these features suggests that, however favorably disposed towards these features, projects had great difficulty (at least until the Quarter 3 essays were written) translating these ideas into effective practical forms. There were provocative exceptions to this general statement, as the following discussion will point out.

A general observation might be made about these two key features, hinted at by some of these essays and stated in others. Because these two requirements are part of Rules and Regulations which place heavy emphasis on local definition of goals and objectives, it was likely that in a certain number of cases teachers were not motivated to improve their skills in these two areas. If so, the two content requirements were seen as irrelevant. Where they were seen as relevant, process and content provisions converged in a fortunate way. One documenter, commenting on the two content requirements in the context of the field-based training provision, put his finger on a central issue for most projects:

> The success of this tactic depends largely on how the participants perceive their needs. If they see little relationship between Teacher Corps goals and the classroom situations they are facing, the training program will have little chance of attracting students. Fortunately, due to the nature of our community, the faculty has a desire for training in multicultural approaches and diagnostic/prescriptive techniques.
>
> It must be kept in mind, however, that success in this area is difficult to measure in the short run because course participation is not necessarily an indication of effective implementation. Teachers may accumulate a great deal of knowledge about various cultures and diagnostic/prescriptive methods without any corresponding change in fundamental attitudes or teaching styles. Change will take place only if they discover that the knowledge enables them to deal more effectively with classroom problems. Unless there is a close relationship between needs and the community-based training, the knowledge will not be internalized or implemented in the classroom.

As suggested by the quote, assuming interest on the part of teachers, projects could communicate knowledge about the two content areas without having much basic impact. As with process requirements, projects interpreted the two content provisions differently, with profound implications for the role of each content provision in project development.

Multicultural Education

The Meanings of Multicultural Education--What does it Mean? The theme was reiterated throughout many, if not most, essays. The following excerpts are typical. From a documenter in a southern, rural project:

> This is a real ball of wax. You can mold it anyway you want to, depending on the color of the wax. We have spent literally weeks in the regional Teacher Corps network trying to decide what it means. I am sure that other projects have had the same experiences.

From a southwestern, urban project:

> We feel perhaps more elaborations on what constitutes multicultural education would be beneficial to all projects in dealing with this area.

From an eastern project in a large city:

> The greatest difficulty experienced occurred in the planning stage when the question of defining multicultural education arose. This problem led to a lively discussion. Multicultural is one of those catchwords that seems to mean different things to different people. Does it refer to ethnicity, race, social, economic, or even sexual subcultures? All of the above? None of the above?

One way or another, projects have experimented with definitions by creating various components labeled multicultural. For most projects, multicultural education, thus, is operationally defined in categories such as the following:

- Courses for teachers on ethnicity, cultural styles, background, or history, designed to promote awareness among course participants.
- Training for teachers in methods or materials for use in their classrooms designed to teach children about different cultures, or which illustrate other lessons (for example, math) with culturally sensitive examples.
- Community analysis or needs assessments, conducted by teachers or interns, to sensitize them and other audiences to the varied cultural makeup of the surrounding community.

- Bilingual education in whatever form (where school populations were substantially non-English speaking).

- Extra-curricular events for the school and/or community, celebrating the diverse cultural elements within the school/community.

Those projects more centrally focused on multicultural education implemented more than one of these components simultaneously.

Discussions of the meaning and form of the multicultural education component were frequently accompanied by a call for help: for materials, methods, and examples of multicultural education in action. Some projects turned to their interns for help; others to the IHE; others to the networks or the federal government. The following essay excerpt from a project in a large, northeastern city was not atypical:

> Multicultural education is an effective implementation tactic which requires much research and firsthand information as a sound basis. Many stereotypes still exist and there is still difficulty in accurate materials suitable for young children. Many materials which are multicultural on the surface have only token, cosmetic factors and do not provide the depth needed for real understanding and knowledge. Using materials with the teachers which help them evaluate books for their depth of information and commitment to multiculturalism has proven successful. Much more needs to be done in securing and disseminating accurate information.
>
> Federal policymakers could provide a service to teachers and other educators in circularizing simple, accurate, concise information on various cultures. It should combine the history of a cultural reality. If a food is a staple of a diet, why is that particular food used? Is it indigenous to the area? etc.

The subject of multicultural education, however defined, and the process of giving it meaning in each project, was emotionally charged. It touched nerves made sensitive by several decades of race consciousness. This complicated the process of exploring the topic and generating workable plans for implementing it. In the following excerpt, a documenter from a rural project in a predominantly white area of the mid-South, explains how the local community interpreted the concept of multicultural education:

> Our project has been and is very committed to instilling within children an understanding and appreciation for the differences that exist among people, but it is not an easily reached goal. The community which we serve is basically rural and agrarian. Many of the families have lived in this area for years. And when someone mentions cultural and ethnic diversity, the standard reply is, "We don't have any."
>
> In addition, our project is fighting another stereotype and that is that the only communities that need to teach multicultural education are the ones where blacks still ride in the back of the bus. For many LEA personnel growing or living through the racial tensions of the last 26 years, multicultural education is synonymous with black/white education. This is where the greatest amount of change has taken place in their lives with the integration of schools, restaurants, and parks. Furthermore, the citizens of this county are proud of their race record. Their community, unlike many others, has been successfully integrated for years, and hence, any mention of multicultural education often kindles resentment among teachers and LEA administrators who insist that they are not prejudiced and resent the federal government for implying that they are.
>
> Because such mistaken ideas do not die easily, our project, over the past 2 years, has devoted considerable energy to simply redefining for the citizens of the county, the concept of multicultural education. First, we have tried to reassure the community that we, too, are proud of their record of successful school and community integration. Secondly, we have explained that multicultural education is not a study of race, but a study of people whose customs, traditions, values, beliefs, and aspirations helped build this country and will continue to build it. Third, we have stressed that even more important than this knowledge is the respect and understanding of others, which such knowledge brings. After all, a person cannot respect another human being until he understands him. And finally, we have emphasized that if our democracy is to continue, it must have active, compassionate citizens who are capable of making sound public decisions.

The passage underscores the importance of the local cultural context for giving meaning to the concept of multicultural education. Other essays from sites with a different cultural makeup illustrate a remarkably different reaction. For example, at the other extreme, a project in a western state with a heterogeneous population experienced a nearly opposite reaction:

> Multiculturality is so much a part of this community's lifestyle that cultural interchange is a process all children grow up with. Much of the sensibilities, thus, with which we perceive and examine other cultures are already well developed in most students. The good exists with the bad. There is a rich potpourri of lifestyles as well as prejudices and discords. The instructional concern for our project has been not in marketing concern for this area, but in resolving questions about dealing with such a great diversity of ethnic cultures. Every teacher in this community is confronted with such a great ethnic diversity in his or her classroom that it is a truly formidable task to deal equitably with the cultural spectrum represented in that one classroom.

The Value of Multicultural Education--In most projects, multicultural education was seen as an important goal. Those projects with a negative perception of the requirement seemed to reflect a corresponding negative reaction or indifference among local teachers and community. As previously noted, this had much to do with the cultural composition of the community and its preconceptions about race or ethnicity. In other cases, the fact that the requirement might be perceived as "prescribed content rather than being responsive to felt need" was a potential problem. Very few projects objected, at a more philosophical level, to the root values on which the multicultural requirement rests, but the observation of one documenter in an extracontinental U.S. site points out that there were grounds, in certain contexts, for objecting:

> A large, vocal group of teachers were hostile to the idea of multicultural education and succeeded in intimidating other teachers. Their primary argument sprang from their perception of America as a melting pot. This idea, popular through the middle 1960s, made sense in the light of the experiences of many who perceived their successful neighbors as those who were most successful in adapting to mainland culture.
>
> The notion of cultural pluralism is a fine one for many settings where there is a social and economic rationale for encouraging it. In fact, however, mandating a multicultural (read "non-U.S. mainstream") component into every project, indiscriminantly, may be self-contradictory. If what is meant by "pluralism" is a type of cultural relativism, it may be that there are communities where pluralism is dysfunctional to many of its members. It may

> be that adopting mainstream culture is to the advantage of certain peoples. The regulations, as written, do not provide for this eventuality. They are written with the assumption that communities value their nonmainstream culture and wish to maintain it. There should be some provision in the regulations for a project demonstrating that a move toward pluralism is not only not a desire of the community, but an actual liability to it, and to replace this component with some type of program that will lead to the understanding of people from different cultures, while allowing the schools and community to continue to move in the direction it wishes. In short, it may not be appropriate for those who write the regulations to assume that a pluralistic society is appropriate everywhere.

A more usual reaction was a statement to the effect that "multicultural education is very important, but we have yet to make it happen in an effective way." For example, from a documenter in a small, western, urban site with a mixed white, black, and Hispanic population:

> On the whole, this proposition is still only a belief and not a value consistently acted upon....

From a semiurban, southern site with a predominantly black, school population:

> Conceptually, I would agree that multicultural education is an important, effective implementation tactic. Striving for this goal should be a continuous effort and is an essential part of a school with a healthy climate. However, based upon project experiences, this goal is elusive and is difficult to achieve.

From a rural, southern site in a predominantly white community:

> I agree with [multicultural education] theoretically. Awareness, appreciation, and acceptance of cultural diversity is a necessity, especially in [this state], with a large percentage of Cuban and Southeast Asian immigrants. But, in reality, it is difficult to impact greatly on a society that still, perhaps unconsciously, is segregated by race, sex, and religion. Teachers left the multicultural education course in the evenings and wished all the "black" custodians a pleasant evening. Prejudices run long and deep even in Christian communities.

These implementation difficulties clearly go beyond the problems of definition to root problems in the society within which staff development takes place.

However, in a few striking examples, multicultural education was not only highly valued, but clearly defined and given a central role in the project. This was especially true of some of the Native American projects, which represented fairly homogeneous communities of a nonmainstream culture (as exemplified by the passage below), but also in a few of the other projects, which contained a greater cultural diversity.

> We realize that we cannot take traditional ways of doing things and simply transplant them in [the] rural [areas of the state]; we encourage creativity and nontraditional course content and forms. We admit that we do not have all the answers. After all, we're after teachers who can be more effective in classrooms primarily composed of Native [American] children. Do we know what such teachers of classrooms should look like? As much as possible, we try to encourage the students to retain all that they can of their own personal and cultural styles, their own "nativeness." We view education as a two-way flow, a cooperative effort between instructors and students. This, in a sense, is the creation of a new culture that is a combination of that which is necessary for participation in the total national society and comes through the traditional educational system and that which arises from the students' own cultures and is necessary for participation in traditional Native society. We must constantly remind ourselves of the latter, but, if we don't, the system has been built in such a way that we are reminded by others. This combination of the political reality, the day-to-day interactions, and the theoretical models developed in the academic program comprise the cross-cultural "component" of [our] program. Without this, there would be no program at all.

Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching

The second content requirement, that trainees' competence in diagnostic/prescriptive approaches to teaching be improved, was conceptually clearer to most projects than the multicultural education requirement. However, definitions varied, and, correspondingly, the requirement's value

was perceived differently. Also, diagnostic/prescriptive teaching was generally seen as an ambitious goal, faced with significant implementation obstacles, no matter how desirable the goal might be.

The Meanings of Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching--Two primary meanings emerge from the essay commentary. One documenter in a western, urban project described both, alluding to a common pattern of response to the two alternatives:

> The use of diagnostic/prescriptive approaches is an effective implementation tactic.
>
> This also was a proposition receiving mixed reactions--some agreement, some disagreement, some wonderment about what so general a term actually meant.
>
> Disagreement seems to stem primarily from past experience in the district when the terms diagnostic/prescriptive were used to describe a system characterized by a great deal of paperwork, mandated teaching approaches, and evaluation of teachers. It also seemed to be based on behavioristic psychology.
>
> Agreement was based on acknowledgment that yes, teachers should be required to analyze the causes of individual learning problems and find alternate ways of dealing with them--with the emphasis on alternate ways as opposed to one set of prescribed techniques.

The first meaning implied a formalized approach to teaching built around a tightly defined set of learning skills. The second implied a more fluid sensitivity of the teacher to individual learner needs, which might or might not be describable in terms of specifiable learner competencies.

Many projects interpreted the requirement to apply to the training process itself, as well as to the teaching skills that were the focus of training. To some, diagnostic/prescriptive training meant little more than basing training on some kind of formalized group needs assessment; more often, some kind of individualized assessment of teachers' needs was implied, either formalized or of a more informal nature. In a few cases where training was based on carefully defined sets of "teaching competencies," diagnosis of teachers' needs was highly specified.

Rooted in the professional debate over behavioristic versus humanistic approaches to teaching, documenters struggled with the meanings and connotations of "diagnosis" and "prescription." On the one hand, more humanistically inclined projects interpreted the requirement as suggested by the documenter from a project in a large, eastern, urban area:

> The phrase diagnostic/prescriptive comes from a medical model. Since medicine is involved with illnesses and treating clients who are ill, the phrase conjures up a focus on deficits and helplessness. Later approaches fostered by the special educators have adapted the meaning to emphasize discovering various modes in learners' styles and encouraging as much independence as is appropriate, while giving extra supports where needed. Our program does not "diagnose" in the sense of giving a label, nor does it "prescribe" in the sense that no choices are given. It does foster careful attention to learners' and teachers' strengths, needs, and interests and to devising integrative curricular and organizatonal offerings and arrangements on the basis of such factors.

On the other hand, projects with a more behavioristic bent saw the approach as a more precise tool for increasing teaching effectiveness:

> Diagnostic/prescriptive teaching is the foundation of our inservice training. Moving teacher training from the intuitive and artistic to the skillful and clinical has had a powerful positive impact on teachers and learning. This analytic approach gives teachers a solid foundation from which to design and present lessons so that students are more likely to achieve. This approach has changed the teaching focus from the teacher to the learner. Specifically, the teaching act does not end with presenting information on a new skill or concept. Rather, it ends after monitoring and guided practice make it nearly certain that

> the learning has occurred. Both teachers and administrators are extremely receptive to this model of teaching because it is concrete and specific rather than abstract and indefinable. Teachers and administrators are now able to factor out the component acts and behaviors of the teaching process, assess them, affirming the strengths and discussing alternatives to improve the lesson.

The language of the requirement clearly left room for this range of interpretations. Though some documenters took note of the ambiguity, few complained about it (those which did lamented the lack of behavioral specificity). Some documenters put their finger on the usefulness of the ambiguous language in the Rules and Regulations; for example, from a documenter in a southern, urban site:

> The project staff has interpreted the term diagnostic/prescriptive teaching in a general sense and recommends that legislation remain as it is so that the individual projects can interpret the term in a manner that best meets local needs. In the general sense, diagnostic/prescriptive teaching simply implies that the needs and deficiencies of students be determined prior to program development and that subsequent program activities be designed to alleviate the known needs and deficiencies. Anything more specific may be restrictive to individual projects.

The Value of Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching--Discussions of the meaning of these terms lapsed naturally into a matter of basic value and educational approach. Many of the essays dealt with these issues at a rhetorical level, rather than in terms of demonstrated benefits or effects. However, a small number of projects illustrated their assertions with clear examples of the benefits derived from the approach. For example, from a documenter in a southern, semiurban site:

> The project has had a high degree of success in using this teaching approach as an implementation tactic. For example, when the county school district (the LEA) was preparing a model to implement a state law which mandates a diagnostic/prescriptive

approach to teaching in grades K-3, the project was able to pilot several key approaches to diagnostic/prescriptive teaching which were incorporated in the district's plan for implementation. This piloting gave the project a high level of support at the LEA and IHE levels since the IHE was also involved in assisting other districts in preparing their proposals.

From a southwestern, urban site:

> As a direct result of the project's professional development center training on diagnostic/prescriptive approaches, four teachers introduced an innovative language arts unit at our project junior high.
>
> These four teachers joined together in a team effort to provide a language arts unit which combines both the learning center approach to teaching and individualized instruction. Two of the teachers had not only participated in the PDC as learners but had also made presentations at the PDC on prescribing learning activities and learning centers. Following the diagnostic/prescriptive PDC, the four teachers (all four were PDC participants) created this innovative unit. To date the team had not worked together designing and teaching language arts based on diagnostic/ prescriptive methods. They attribute their experience at PDC as giving them the motivation and confidence to design this unit.

While projects appeared generally favorable to the idea of diagnostic/prescriptive teaching, many questions were raised about the practicality of diagnostic/prescriptive approaches, especially those wedded to elaborate record-keeping and formalized disgnostic testing. One documenter's observations, from a project in an eastern city, summarizes well the experience of many projects:

> With the origin and increasingly sophisticated development of the diagnostic/prescriptive approach to teaching, a tool for addressing individual student differences now seems available, so it was with some enthusiasm and optimism that the teachers in our project moved to adopt this approach in their classrooms. Although theoretically sound, some practical problems began to develop in implementation.
>
> Diagnostic tests are vital starting points in ascertaining where pupil skill deficiencies lie, and standardized tests are most often employed for this purpose. The notion is that once weaknesses are identified, then objectives can be formulated, and effective remediation can begin.

Although a large variety of diagnostic/prescriptive tests were found to be available in reading and math, it soon became apparent that this was not true for most of the other subjects. Standardized test scores might be available in social studies, for example, but these were of limited use in pinpointing discrete skill deficiencies. Further, many teachers proved to be alarmingly inadequate in their ability to interpret and utilize the diagnostic instruments that were available. Therefore, they found it difficult to design and implement individualized programs. Sometimes their designs managed to be so mechanistic as to virtually eliminate any intervention by the teacher at all! These problems would tend to indicate the need for a large-scale, intensive, teacher inservice training program, which would exceed the resources of the current project.

Finally, the limited number of teachers who did manager to surmount the hurdles detailed above reported that the whole process was so time consuming that it placed unreasonable demands on their time and energy. The charge was, in effect, to write an Individualized Instruction Program for each pupil in each subject.

Also when the point of prescribing remediation was reached, most of the teachers seemed woefully unaware of new strategies and materials in their fields. Worse, the schools seemed to have no institutionalized ongoing structures designed to keep teachers abreast of new materials and curricular developments.

Subtle problems also occurred when projects applied diagnostic approaches to culturally diverse settings, as a documenter in an eastern, semiurban project pointed out:

It is very important to notice that the diagnostic/prescriptive approach connects with the multicultural strand in that many perceived learning and behavior problems are the result of cultural differences between the teacher and student or between the student and the institutions of the school system. If the teacher has a good understanding of the students' background and community, some of these problems may dissolve and many will at least become more manageable. Those that remain will then be recognized as what they are, and can be more accurately diagnosed and treated. Lumping cultural differences in with behavior and learning problems is to confuse a conflict in values with a physical or psychological difficulty, and to use medical techniques to deal with an essentially intellectual disagreement. So I believe in the long run, an integrated tactic employing multicultural education and diagnostic/prescriptive approaches is more effective than working with either in isolation.

Because of these complexities, it was easier to give inservice training about diagnostic/prescriptive approaches, than to make them happen in the classroom. Recognizing this lack, a documenter in an extracontinental U.S. project pointed out an important link between training and practice, which many projects failed to forge:

> In and of themselves, diagnostic/prescriptive teaching approaches have not been found to be particularly successful implementational tactics unless they are presented in accompaniment with follow-up support systems of direct aids for the teachers. In workshop evaluations administered during this past school year, teachers invariably requested follow-up aid of some sort if they were interested at all in implementing the workshop content. The significance of this observation lies somewhere in the nature of training and in the intricacies of the teaching task itself. The diagnostic/prescriptive approach presumes that the teacher will be able to make some kind of quick diagnostic assessment of an instructional situation and on the basis of that prescribe some strategy to meet the assessed needs of the situation. The fact of the matter is that a teacher must operate after this fashion, trying in a computer-like manner to data-process the needs of 30 or more students in one class and 150 or more students in a single day. Such a task is hardly realizable. A teacher, in reality, develops over a period of time certain instincts by which he or she manages the instructional situation. These instincts allow one to anticipate in most instances the interactive dynamics of a class situation and to react quickly and decisively. We generally recognize the attainment of these instincts under such labels as "the experienced teacher." Inservice teaching training generally introduces new strategies often involving new ways of looking at things and new sets of behaviors. What results in the application of these new strategies to the intensity of the classroom is that the teacher finds himself or herself trying to operate with a new set of untested and unfamiliar strategies and without the support of the familiar instincts of management. The usual result is the report that, "It doesn't work." If inservice teacher training aspires to change teacher behaviors, it must support that change in the classroom itself. This follow-up support is critical. Otherwise there is very little assurance that much of any training will find its place in the classroom.

Once again, the question lingers: how practical is individualized teacher follow-up, when training applies to large numbers? Whether this and other matters of practical application were resolved during the second operational year (Year 3) remains an open question, one which will require later data sets to answer.

Quarter 5 Documentation*

This summary reports patterns in essays submitted in late fall of the 1980-81 school year describing inservice training arrangements and project impacts as of that date. Program 78 projects were at that time in the middle of their second operational year (Year 3 of the Teacher Corps grant); Program 79 projects were in the middle of their first operational year.

The essay assignment was divided into three main sections that provide a convenient way of organizing the essay commentary:

- The primary focus of inservice training (including content/process goals, the way in which a focus was determined, the role of the teacher in shaping inservice training).
- Strategies for delivery of training (including the nature of training events, and the IHE's role in the training process).
- Perceived contributions of Teacher Corps training to an improved personnel development system in the LEA (including types of contribution to improved LEA inservice systems and impacts on IHEs').

The summary is based on 31 out of a possible 49 essays, in other words, a response rate of 63%. The 49 projects sent this essay were chosen to represent the full population of "regular" projects (excluding Youth Advocacy or Native American projects, or those outside of the Continental United States). The responding subset of essays appears to proportionately represent all major categories of the projects, as indicated by Table 2, with one exception: beginning urban projects were greatly underrepresented.

---

*The findings from the Quarter 5 documentation include data from both Program 78 Program 79 projects.

Table 2

PROPORTION OF PROJECTS RESPONDING
TO QUARTER 5 INSERVICE ESSAY

	Beginning[b]	Continuing[b]	Total
Rural	60%[a] (5)	67%[a] (6)	58%[a] (11)
Semiurban	83% (6)	75% (8)	79%[a] (14)
Urban	29% (7)	65% (17)	54%[a] (24)
	56%[a] (18)	68%[a] (31)	63% (49)

a - % of cell, row, or column and total in cell, row, or column.

b - Program 78 and 79 projects are represented among responding projects in each cell, and overall, a comparable proportion of each cohort responded: 65% of Program 79 and 59% of Program 78 projects.

Primary Focus of Inservice Training

Each project faced and resolved the problem of focusing inservice training efforts in different ways. For the moment disregarding differences in the specific content of training, the results of efforts can be characterized as relatively more or less "focused," in the sense that an integrated set of concerns were chosen as themes for training and delivered in a coordinated way. Two sets of opposed forces appeared to be at work. First, IHE requirements (and in some cases, those of the LEA as well) tended to push toward a cohesive, integrated training "curriculum" and approach, while the diverse needs of individual target schools tended to fragment training efforts. Second, within a given school, individual teachers often needed--or wanted--very different things from training activities; the effort to satisfy individual needs seemed often to run counter to more coordinated efforts at training for "whole school improvement." This is not to say that projects could not provide highly individualized training in a focused way. Some did with apparent success but in doing so they resisted the "line of least resistance": a series of ad hoc responses to different requests for training assistance.

Essays from two Program 79 projects dramatize the extremes. On the one hand, the documenter from a project in a northeastern, semiurban area said:

> It is not possible to describe the primary focus of our inservice program because there is no single thrust. The underlying philosophy has been to provide the staff in the four Teacher Corps schools with what they need to improve schooling for the children in those buildings. This philosophy has resulted in a wide variation of inservice activities as each attempts to respond to a need expressed by a single teacher, a group of teachers, or the staff of an entire building or several buildings. As a result, no one inservice "program" has emerged. Instead, there is a vast array of activities which will be divided into four main categories and described in the second section of this essay. The categories include (1) courses, (2) consultations, (3) conferences, and (4) the activities of the interns.

At the other end of the continuum, a documenter in a comparable Western project indicated:

> A primary emphasis of our program is on the improvement of basic teaching skills. Intensive training in the elements of instruction and principles of learning is presented. Specifically this includes: teaching to an objective, selecting objectives at the correct level of difficulty; monitoring and adjusting, and using principles of learning (set, closure, motivation, retention, reinforcement). Within this framework are several sessions aimed at specifically improving the diagnostic and prescriptive abilities of the classroom teacher. Task analysis is taught as a method by which teachers break down terminal (long-range) objectives into more manageable, enroute learnings for use in instruction. These instructional objectives and learning to teach them comprise the core of the cycle, and several sessions are spent learning to identify, write, and use meaningful prescriptive objectives at the correct level of difficulty. Also explored are ways of more effectively monitoring student progress toward the objective during instruction, and then adjusting teacher behaviors in response to that monitoring. To further enhance diagnostic skills, the different learning modalities of students (visual, auditory, kinesthetic) are investigated. Ways of identifying modalities and techniques for teaching those modal strengths are offered.

While both projects try to address individual teacher's needs, the former did so in an eclectic, ad hoc way, while the latter did so by means of a carefully integrated "total approach" to the problem.

Neither extreme should be thought of as intrinsically better; there are potential dangers either way. Nor should resolutions of the focus problem be thought to be static. Initially unfocused efforts can converge over time; also what appears haphazard and ad hoc on the surface can reflect a more consistent underlying approach toward training in particular local circumstances. For example, one project in an eastern, urban area facing severe retrenchment coped with the lack of motivation for inservice training in the following way:

> The site school teachers have available to them a variety of colleges from which they can earn graduate credit. They also have available an extensive inservice operation run by the school district. This operation offers inservice credit for a minimum of effort (class attendance and little outside work). Teachers can

use either graduate or inservice credit to improve their salary grade. A sizable majority of teachers have accumulated all the credits they need for such improvement. Thus, only a minority of teachers are motivated to pursue credits in structured learning situations for monetary reasons....

Furthermore, teachers do not define their own or their schools' needs in terms of the development of their own skills. If one constructs a needs analysis asking whether they would like to learn "x," they will respond positively. However, their professed need is not strong enough to lead them to action. For example, the project scheduled workshops around a professed need. Only one or two teachers attended. Alternately, the project offered the teachers the chance to schedule, select, or design their own workshops. They took no action....

...Any training program the project designs must recognize that many of the teacher clientele have no motivation to participate in inservice activities as traditionally offered. There can be no training with a well-defined set of outcomes which will draw in participants.

In order to attract participants, the project realized that they would have to have an inservice program which would meet the educational needs of the teachers as the teachers perceived them. That is, the program would have to be individualized for each participant. Thus, our focus became to help teachers deal more effectively with children by helping the teachers gain any skill which they felt to be important. There are not a few, clearly defined teacher needs served by this program because there are no generally recognized specific teacher needs in the setting. The fact that "to improve diagnostic/prescriptive skills" and "to improve attitudes..." also were perceived as important indicates that these are staff priorities toward which we hold to indirectly lead teachers while meeting their own inservice requests.

Projects used different organizing principles to build their inservice training systems, among them: a strong training philosophy and methodology, a coalition of IHE faculty, a field-based consensus on needs, a series of individual requests, or some combination of these.

The Content of Training.

Generally speaking, the content of inservice training in most projects had to do with specific classroom needs, more often than not explicitly related to teaching low-income children. However, the two content requirements of the Rules and Regulations (diagnostic/ prescriptive teaching and multicultural education) were inconsistently favored by projects, as the raings by the documenters indicates (see Table 3).

Table 3

RANKINGS OF CONTENT GOALS BY DOCUMENTERS

Content Goals of Training Activities	Rankings		
	Most Important	Moderate Importance	Little Importance
Improved classroom, school climate	25	3	1
Improved classroom management skills	20	5	4
Diagnostic/prescriptive skills	19	10	0
Improved attitudes of teachers	18	6	5
Teacher-Community communication and collaboration	16	10	3
Collaboration among teachers within school	14	11	4
Improved curriculum and school programs	10	15	2
Multicultural education	9	15	5
Education for exceptional children	7	14	8

The relative weighting of particular content areas seemed to depend in part on characteristics of the project setting and in part on local educational priorities. For example, projects with more ethnically diverse populations (especially those with large, Hispanic populations) seemed to place greater value on training in multicultural education. Urban projects, often beset by severe decline conditions, seemed to place strong value on training related to improving teacher attitudes and/or school climate. Rural sites, with stronger, more cohesive communities, sought to emphasize teacher-community communication and collaboration more often than urban or semiurban projects.

The IHE's own formal training curricula also seemed to impose some shape on the content of training, for example, in projects that saw the inservice mandate as an opportunity to develop a new inservice or field-based master's program.

The Process of Developing a Focus for Inservice Training.

Here it is often hard to see behind the rhetoric of essays. Although nearly every essay described or alluded to "collaborative" planning processes, the input of different role groups was far from equal. The degree to which teachers took an active role in determining the forms for training varied considerably. In a few cases, that role was minimal and was associated with a subsequent lack of teacher commitment to the training itself. More frequently, teachers "participated" in the focusing process through their responses to needs assessment surveys, while the primary decisions about training focus remained in the hands of IHE, LEA, or project training staff. In a number of cases, especially those emphasizing school-level planning, teachers seemed to play a much more prominent role in training system design through their participation on staff development planning committees of one kind or another, but even so this did not guarantee active involvement or a sense of "ownership," as one documenter in a midwestern, semiurban project indicated:

> One particular problem within our project has been teacher involvement/input. Only through the Program Content Planning Team (PCPT) has there been actual teacher representation. Therefore, the use of the 5-week evaluation has provided the opportunity for teachers to feel some ownership of the Project.

Ultimately, teachers "voted with their feet," by choosing to attend certain kinds of training events. That, and the feedback from them about the events they did attend, shaped later inservice training activities to some extent.

One hypothesis emerged about teacher input: those projects with more carefully specified and cohesive training focus (for example, those based on defined teaching competencies) reflected less teacher input into the planning of inservice, and a more dominant IHE-rooted training philosophy. However, this hypothesis remains to be tested.

Inservice Training Strategy and Delivery

Most projects appeared to use an eclectic training strategy. A variety of approaches were tried within each project, ranging from formal coursework to informal projects or consultations. The general pattern seemed to be one of matching the variety of teachers' interests and requests with a smorgasbord of possibilities bearing the label "inservice training."

Types of training events.

In a rough order from the more formalized large, group-oriented events to the less formal, more individually oriented ones, the primary types of training events included the following:

- Graduate courses. Typically delivered in the field at the school site, these events involved a succession of regular meetings devoted to covering a topic in the regular IHE curriculum. However, often these courses are tailored to the more practical orientation of course- takers, for example, a course in "Reading in the Content Area."

- Ongoing workshops and minicourses. Overlapping with the field-based coursework described above, some projects put together repeated sessions devoted to specific topics of interest to groups of teachers and not necessarily linked to a formal course of any kind. An apparently successful variant is a regular "brown-bag seminar" for all school staff.

- One-shot workshops. Varying in length from those lasting an hour after school to summer retreats of several weeks' duration, one-shot workshops addressing every conceivable topic were the most frequent form of training event. Almost all projects had numerous events of this type, and clearly it was about the easiest way to organize group inservice instruction. However, the precise boundary between "one-shot workshops" and an interrelated series of workshops is hard to establish. Extended "retreats" seemed especially popular in rural sites and seemed to take on most of the characteristics of formal on-campus coursework. A noticeable number of projects noted that one-shot workshops built around outside guest speakers tended to be less effective, as described by a documenter in a western, semiurban project:

  > One training activity seems to have been less effective than others. A consultant was brought in for a 1-day workshop to both inform the participants concerning the change process and then to hopefully involve them in a major change. The consultant was well received; however, the idea (the change plan) was rejected. In analyzing the process and the problem we realized that the major drawback was insufficient diagnosis on the part of the consultant. He knew his material, but did not know our participants (a secondary school staff) or the extent of their resistance. Because of this lack of understanding on his part, the approach he chose was ineffective and the training was rejected.

  But there were certain conditions where the outside speaker device motivated workshop attendance.

- Small group activities. In many school sites, small groups of teachers gathered under the aegis of Teacher Corps for a variety of training activities, including what might loosely be called "workshops," as well as project activities such as the production of a multicultural cookbook.

- Individual training activities. Many projects offered teachers individual training opportunities, either in the form of consultation about specific teaching or contracted training of various kinds.

- Miscellaneous training activities. Less common and largely informal, various other events or approaches added to the repertoire of certain projects, including minigrants for teachers, teacher participation in conferences, demonstration/observation, curriculum development work, and intern-teacher interaction. Also, the participation of teachers on planning committees was noted by some projects as an important training or staff development activity.

Projects usually included many different types of training events in their overall training strategy. The following list was typical of the more active projects:

To date, 10 specific "delivery systems" have been used to meet the inservice requests. They are:

(1) Graduate courses - three offered at school sites.

(2) Mini-courses - to assist teachers in computer programs.

(3) Workshops with specific themes--three conducted during summer and one during first semester.

(4) Enrichment projects--assisting individual teachers with special interests.

(5) Demonstrations/presentations to interested groups-- three provided first semester.

(6) Observations followed by discussions of what was observed.

(7) Consultations--arranging for specialists to consult with individuals and small groups.

(8) Sharing of diagnostic data - helping teachers interpret learner data and arrange instruction based on that data.

(9) Curriculum development projects.

(10) Professional travel.

Distinguishing Training Strategies

Essays do not give much insight into the exact mix of training events or approaches in the Teacher Corps projects. Perhaps, the nature of this aspect of project activity was so varied in most cases as to be difficult to characterize in any succinct way. Nonetheless, projects appeared to differ from one another along three important dimensions, each with implications for the organization of training and for its ultimate impact on the classrooms. Depending on where they fell on each dimension, projects exhibited more or less distinctive "strategies" of training. How these projects differ from one another is discussed on the following pages.

i. The degree of individualization in training. Most projects were described as, in some degree, responsive to the individual interests or needs of teachers. At the least, the overall array of inservice offerings was based on some form of needs assessment, often prioritized by committees with representation of the teachers. Also typically, teachers chose courses or events of greatest interest to them. The following description from a western, semiurban site captured the spirit of many:

> The focus of the training is defined by individual teachers to varying degrees. At the three target schools, all inservices were derived from prioritized lists of needs which were originated entirely by the staffs. At both Staff Development Center and the IHE, teachers select the workshops and sessions that fit their needs and answer their questions. In this way, they are selecting their own focus of training.

However, a substantial proportion of projects went much further, putting considerable emphasis on individually structured training activities with the goal of maximizing individual professional growth opportunities. This generally happened in one of two ways.

First, at the extreme, the majority of training was formally structured around individually contracted or designed learning activities; an example, is described by a documenter from a mid-Atlantic, urban project:

> Two types of inservice training have been delivered. First, teachers in the cluster schools have the opportunity to enter into the Independent Study Contract through which each participant defines an area of focus and identifies the most appropriate counsel for the contract. These agreements can be translated into either graduate credit or inservice increments. Second, the project staff has conducted training activities in each of the cluster schools for the purpose of clarifying the Evaluation and Monitoring System. One aspect of the EMS, which has created considerable interest and concern by the teachers, is the monthly verification process of the EMS wherein the Teacher Corps staff prepares a test of the mathematics content taught over a 4-week period. Test results are quickly returned to the teachers. While substantial developments have not been observed to date, this testing process appears to be producing a foundation from which substantive inservice programs may be forthcoming, primarily because of teacher interest and concern. Another aspect of the EMS, which has produced encouraging reactions by teachers is the process of academic monitoring. During the past quarter, four teachers were trained to use the data collection processes of the EMS and to observe their colleagues in action. The Teacher Corps staff was unsure whether teachers would accept other teachers as monitors in their classrooms. However, such objections did not materialize, and the participants testified to the importance of this type of training.

Variations on this theme put somewhat less emphasis on the contracted nature of training, or the formalized monitoring that accompanied it, and instead created somewhat less formalized ways of promoting teacher self-direction in learning.

Second and more commonly, individual "project activity" or "consultation" was often included as one of several options in an array of different training events. In one southern, rural project, for example, teachers could choose between three forms of training:

(1) "Formal" (on-campus and on-site coursework).

(2) "Informal" (meetings, ad hoc presentations, workshops, task force meetings, and so on).

(3) "Nonobtrusive" (Teacher Corps staff or others working with teachers individually)

The focus of individualized training was often a specific classroom problem, but it could also be a topic of special interest to the teacher in question or an event that took the teacher away from the school site, to a conference, IHE library, or other information resource. While this emphasis in training had clear power to deal directly with both classroom specifics or general career growth, it also had the potential to veer away from the Teacher Corps basic outcome concerning school climate improvement. In some projects, a conscious choice was made to meet one or the other goal. Others optimistically claimed that both could be met simultaneously, for example, in a rural, southern project:

> The teacher's personal goals and needs and those of the schools are congruently being met through inservice training.

But a tension between satisfying individual professional needs (as construed by the teacher) and orienting training towards school climate improvement seemed to lie behind many discussions of training approach.

ii. Degree of follow-up. It was one thing to expose teachers in training events to new ideas or skills; it was another to follow up on training by visiting teachers in their classrooms to encourage, advise, observe, or otherwise support the application of training ideas to classroom settings. Many projects devised follow-up procedures of various kinds; it seemed that such projects were more likely to influence teaching behavior. Although there were many variations on the theme, two principal approaches emerged.

The first might be called short-term follow-up and consisted of in-class visits by project staff or inservice instructors or both, usually with reference to the content of related inservice activities:

> Another effective training activity was the direct application (and immediate) of theory to the classroom where participants were teaching. Followed by immediate feedback where technical assistance was given, this provided the necessary support needed by those who were implementing within the classroom.

The second might be called long-term follow-up and involved training a group of teachers from the project schools to act in a training-and-support role when they returned to their schools. This was less common than the immediate follow-up described above and represented an investment in an ongoing follow-up capacity which would remain in schools over time.

Some provocative examples of this approach are described, as in the excerpt below from a documenter in a mid-Atlantic, rural project, in which the cadre of follow-up teachers was carefully chosen and trained for their roles in the project schools:

> The project conducted needs assessments through personal sensing interviews with each of the teachers at the school site. The interviews served as the basis for identifying which of the teachers were thought of by their peers as being the most respected and knowledgeable of the staff and a means of assembling a cadre of teachers that could be trained as inservice leaders. The sensing interview was done face to face with a member of the Teacher Corps staff so that the possibility of misunderstanding would be kept to a minimum. It also demonstrated that the individual being interviewed was important enough to be singled out for questioning and that their opinions were valued and noted.... The creation of leadership teams has already begun to pay off in the area of trust building and cohesion between the secondary and elementary schools. The leadership teams have taken over some of the responsibilities of program management from the IHE in the areas of planning and follow-up.

A variation on the theme in a southern, urban project reiterates a pattern occurring in a large number of projects:

> One strategy used by Teacher Corps has broadened the number of teachers participating in inservice activities and subsequent school programs. Approximately 30 % of the teachers at each project school have participated in two 2-day retreats. This cadre of highly motivated and trained teachers then returns to the school and involves the entire faculty/staff in activities designed to improve school climate. The principals' participation in this cadre is important, for his/her support in calling faculty meetings and involving the rest of the faculty is necessary. Additionally, Teacher Corps has activated talented teachers as consultants for short workshops conducted at the school site immediately before or after school. The concept and talent will remain after Teacher Corps funding has ended.

Whether this kind of investment in local leadership proves effective in the long run remains to be seen; the project described in the above example is only now completing its first operational year.

As suggested in the preceding excerpt, the school principal played an important role in supporting training efforts, thus providing an additional kind of follow-up. Training efforts appeared more likely to make it into the classroom where this support existed. A documenter in a midwestern, semiurban project indicated what the absence of principal support might mean:

> The absence of principal leadership evidences itself in two important ways: (1) absence of organization and communication skills beyond the basics of day-to-day building operation and (2) absence of "teaching" skills necessary for channeling staff behaviors in positive directions. First, LEA building administrators usually have been unable, or unwilling, to remember meeting dates or arrangements, to follow through on commitments, or to alter building organization or logistics to accommodate project activities. In addition, they exhibit (or fail to exhibit) similar behaviors when responding to LEA-initiated activities. The absence of effective leadership skills of the kind described here may be attributed to lack of training, neglect on the part of the former superintendent, or a "near retirement-don't care" attitude on the part of those involved. In any case, project activity has been impeded as a result. A positive note in this regard is that, partly as a result of project activities, the LEA superintendent has given attention to the matter and has, among other things, organized a regular monthly administrative council meeting, including Teacher Corps, LEA, and IHE staff.

iii. Role of the IHE in Inservice Delivery: The IHE took on different roles in inservice training systems. Three types of roles might be distinguished, along with numerous variations on each one: (1) primary initiator, (2) supportive facilitator, and (3) expert consultant/leader. In addition to these characteristic roles, IHE members functioned in almost all projects as inservice instructors, alongside LEA training staff, project staff members, or outside consultants. Examples of each of the primary roles help to explain what the role meant.

As primary initiators, IHE members (often in their capacity as project staff) took the major responsibility for coordinating and delivering training activities, with varying degrees of input from the participants. A documenter's description from a midwestern, urban site was typical of many projects:

> Most of the inservice training, then, is provided through the IHE as credit-bearing courses. These courses, however, frequently are not "canned" courses already being taught. More frequently they are designed specifically to meet the needs of the teachers we serve. Courses which are taken from our regular catalog offerings are usually adapted to meet our specific needs.
>
> In addition to this kind of cooperation, IHE faculty members have been involved in teaching courses and workshops as part of our inservice program. Not only have Department of Education faculty participated, but faculty members from other departments at the university have also been involved.
>
> The LEA's involvement has been somewhat less. This year, however, the LEA has provided 2 days during the year for building-level inservice activities. In addition to this district-level commitment to inservice training, the principal of our high school has indicated a willingness to use staff meetings for inservice programs rather than the usual administrative and housekeeping duties.

In such projects it seemed that as institutions, the IHEs were more affected than the LEAs.

In other cases, IHE members acted in a more facilitative or supporting role, in an effort to encourage initiative from LEA and school personnel, or to respond to such initiatives where they already existed. The following excerpt from a documenter in a midwestern, urban project hints at this:

> The role of the IHE in providing inservice training has, for the most part, consisted of faculty members serving as resource personnel to various school committees in planning the activities and serving as instructors for the various afterschool classes held in the project schools. Faculty members were required to develop syllabi for the needs identified and adjust these syllabi to the 1-hour graduate credit format. Inservice instructors are also required to travel to the school site to teach the course.

In other cases, IHE members took on a more active facilitative role, especially in the planning stages of inservice systems.

In many other projects, the IHE provided a source of expertise, as consultants on particular topics when needed. In such cases, like the one described below by a documenter in a western, semiurban project, the center of gravity for project activities tended to reside within the LEA itself, or within the project staff:

> Our IHE, has served a dual training role by offering both on campus workshops for advanced training in our identified need areas, and by providing faculty consultants to facilitate sessions either at the Staff Development Center or at a project school site.

The project staff itself, often consisting of people primarily identified with the IHE, typically mediated between IHE faculty or departments and LEA district personnel. The often-mentioned gap between IHE and LEA meant that IHE members, in whatever role, faced a credibility problem with local school or school district personnel. Various factors appeared to establish credibility, among them the ability of IHE members to share the initiative and responsibility. In several provocative cases, team teaching arrangements (inservice taught jointly by IHE and LEA personnel) were developed, with a visible impact on credibility. For example, from a midwestern, semiurban site:

> The most effective aspect of the inservice training appears to be the team-teaching approach, particularly, the teaming of an LEA instructor (supervisor) and an IHE professor. These experiences have had significant reciprocal effects causing our project's intergroup relationship to greatly improve.
>
> Throughout the second year of implementation, as more of the IHE graduate faculty became involved, the relationship between the LEA and IHE has been strengthened. One IHE professor teaching the course on contemporary issues impacting the LEA is a former LEA teacher/administrator. His experience was quite positive.

Projects with a past history of Teacher Corps activity appeared to have a head start on establishing and maintaining a credible role in the LEAs or schools.

Contributions to an Improved Personnel Development System

As mentioned in several of the essays, it was a little soon to tell how Teacher Corps efforts would contribute to an improved personnel development system for teachers of low-income children. Program 79 projects were only in their first year of training; Program 78 projects in their second. As a consequence, many documenters responded to this section of the essay assignment in terms of "proximate" impacts (types of inservice offerings and participation levels) rather than the ultimate impact of training on classroom practice or school climate. Also, it was not easy--either for documenters or for SRI as it interpreted their essays--to establish which elements of the present personnel development system could be attributed to Teacher Corps efforts, either under current or past funding.

"Personnel development system" referred in most essays, as in the essay assignment, to staff development practices and arrangements in the LEA, even though the language of the Rules and Regulations is broader and not specific to a given LEA. However, many essays referred to, or implied, impacts on the IHE's "personnel development system" as well (that is, its practices and arrangements for inservice or preservice training). These will be discussed separately below, as conceptually distinct contributions to the preparation of teachers serving low-income children.

Contributions to the LEA's Personnel Development System

Teacher Corps projects seemed to take place either in LEAs with little or no systematic inservice prior to Teacher Corps, or in those with extensive inservice systems. The former case was more typical of LEAs in rural areas or small cities; the latter more commonly the case in LEAs within large, urban areas.

If one were to generalize, essays suggest that in the former situation, Teacher Corps made a substantial and visible impact on the inservice system (if there was one at all) or in some cases brought about the first such system. A documenter from a project (with no prior Teacher Corps experience) in a small, midwestern city stated it bluntly:

> As a consequence of project staff development activities to date, more than 75% percent of the LEA staff has completed some professional inservice. Additional staff currently are involved in ongoing inservice. Previously, no inservice offerings were available through the LEA, and only university courses were available through IHE.

In other instances, where minimal LEA inservice had previously taken place, Teacher Corps was apparently responsible for turning it into a more systematic and comprehensive effort. A project in a small, western city typifies what a number of projects seem to have accomplished in similar circumstances, as the following excerpt from the documenter indicates:

> The Teacher Corps project has provided - as opposed to altering or expanding--the district with a personnel development system. The components of that system are:
>
> (1) The Inservice Council, a group that represents district teachers and administrators, university persons, and community people and oversees staff development.
>
> (2) Ongoing identification of needs through written needs assessment surveys, oral communication with all the populations in the district, all written and oral evaluations of all staff development offerings.
>
> (3) Planning how to meet needs.
>
> (4) Delivering inservice education.
>
> (5) Monitoring application of the inservice education in the classroom.
>
> (6) Recycle items 2-5 (above), with the Inservice Council overseeing the process.
>
> Previous to Teacher Corps, the district had no system of organized inservice; inservice training consisted basically of individual teachers taking coursework, attending some

> conferences, and participating in workshops. Now teachers and administrators are going through programs involving themselves voluntarily over periods of time (as opposed to onetime offerings) and concentrating on areas which they have indicated as needs/interests.
>
> Moreover, teachers, administrators, and parents are all participating in various aspects of the planning, delivering, and evaluating of staff development activities.

Teacher Corps' contributions to LEAs with elaborate staff development systems already in place are less easy to discern and to demonstrate. A documenter from a recently begun project in a small, midwestern city observed:

> Since the LEA has an impressive number of inservice training activities, it is not certain there have been changes in numbers or types of people participating. It does appear that those persons who have been teaching for at least 6 years or more, some as long as 25 years, who could not for some reason or other seek out a master's degree, took advantage of the IHE offer to develop an on-site, field-based degree program.

But, as the quote indicates, not all needs were met by the existing system, and Teacher Corps was thus able to find a role. In other instances, essays described subtle contributions to existing inservice systems; Teacher Corps refined the delivery approaches, extended the offerings, or more closely attuned the offerings to documented needs of specific teachers or school sites. A documenter in a midwestern city with a strong inservice capacity (built over the years with considerable Teacher Corps input in former cycles) summarized his project's current contribution in this way:

> The LEA staff development program is one of the best in the nation. Our role, then, is to enrich and provide more localized application of the regular program. We are demonstrating a means to respond quickly to needs through the request/response process, and to develop teachers with specialized skills and knowledge who then can train others in the years to come. By sharing resources, we have been able to build up the professional libraries for use by all teachers in the district, but especially in the project schools. Finally, we have demonstrated a continuing process of school-university-community collaboration, which has strengthened the local, staff development program.

Types of Impact--At the least, most projects claimed to have impact on both the number and types of inservice offerings available to teachers, and the number and types of people participating in the inservice events. Stated in this way, these "contributions" to improved personnel development are hard to evaluate, but they do represent a trend in the right direction. The following essay excerpt from a northwestern project located in a small city described a common pattern in both Program 78 and 79 projects:

> The Teacher Corps inservice activities can be considered as an improvement on the local personnel development training for the following reasons.
>
> A new "mix" of people attend the Teacher Corps activities. In addition to having teachers from both the elementary and secondary schools involved in the same sessions, principals and other administrators, nonteaching staff, such as secretaries and clerks, social workers, community council members, and interns are found together in courses and workshops. This represents a new opportunity for many points of view to be heard at the same time. This process alone has increased the communication within and among schools and between schools and the community.
>
> The Teacher Corps offerings are more versatile than what has been done in the past. An increased interest in multicultural activities, special needs children, guidance and counseling skills are examples of this wider look at the inservice needs of school personnel. The needs are met not only by faculty from the IHE but also from a variety of agencies within the community.
>
> ...Although it is somewhat early to talk about the effect of the inservice activities, the feedback to date has been positive. Perhaps the most telling result is that people are asking for more. Ideas are continuously being suggested from many different segments of the school staff and the community council. Activities originally intended for the first semester are being extended to the next and additional people are expressing an interest in them. For this reason it seems accurate at this point in time to say that Teacher Corps is making a positive contribution to the personnel development system in the four participating schools.

The increased number of participants and types of offerings were more often than not symptomatic of basic changes in the way LEA inservice was organized. A documenter's discussion of the numbers, in relation to key elements in the current Teacher Corps approach, is revealing:

> The level of teacher participation in inservice training has increased. According to teachers interviewed, this increase has been attributed to the collaborative mode of planning, which included teachers, teacher aides, administrators, and Teacher Corps staff.

The excerpt highlights an often-repeated point: Teacher Corps has set in motion an inservice planning process, emphasizing collaboration of a range of key constituents, and often featuring a more central role for teachers. In one northeastern, urban project, where teachers were given this kind of central role, the results appeared to be particularly effective, as described below:

> Teacher Corps' greatest benefit to the schools has been involving teachers in identifying areas of need and in planning programs and courses to meet their identified needs. Those programs of inservice which resulted in a tangible product seem to have been particularly effective. When a concrete program, designed by teachers, published by Teacher Corps results, the teachers seem to feel a greater sense of accomplishment and also seem more willing to work over a longer period of time in implementing their product.

In this same spirit, a number of documenters listed committee work (referring usually to teacher or administrator involvement on project planning committees of several kinds) as a kind of training activity. In a southern, urban project the organizational shift from a somewhat detached and less successful LEA inservice system to one more closely tied to a school-level planning process relying heavily on teachers' input indicates how this kind of "improvement" operated in several ways at once:

> It is the project's belief that the Teacher Corps project has developed an inservice training system which represents an improvement in the LEA's personnel development process. In the past the LEA has provided workshops mainly on the state mandated inservice days. Outside consultants were hired, and district staff persons (teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, etc.) were not involved in the process. Needs assessments were conducted at the district level; therefore, they yielded generalized results which appeared to be inapplicable to any individual school. Inservice activities centered mainly upon workshops. Follow-up activities to workshops were nonexistent.

> In contrast to this, Teacher Corps centers its inservice program around "grass-roots" involvement, mainly through the use of professional development committees at each of the schools. With this approach, district personnel, as well as community members, have input in every stage of the inservice program. The committee conducts needs assessments, designs their inservice activities, and in the future will learn to evaluate them. Needs assessments are currently done at the school level and reflect more specific needs of students and teachers. Teamwork and involvement are the main forces behind the program, and follow-up activities are an automatic feature of professional development. Inservice activities include not only workshops, but also classroom demonstrations, expert consultation, clinical supervision and involvement in the actual inservice process itself.

These kinds of impacts on LEA inservice activities seem to be a natural outgrowth of Teacher Corps efforts in most projects. They seem to represent both short-term improvements in those projects of recent vintage, and in many cases of repeated Teacher Corps funding, a longer-term change in the way inservice needs within LEAs are met. The extent to which these changes will last beyond Teacher Corps funding remains at this point an open question, though there is some evidence that these practices are becoming common practice in many sites. Also, the question of tangible implications of training for the problems of classroom or school is largely unanswered by the essays and difficult to measure in any event. Some essays, however, do hint at demonstrable effects in the classroom or school. For example, in a southern, urban project, one project noted a drop in office referrals of disciplinary cases following inservice efforts focused on school management issues, but the example is a conspicuously isolated one.

One further question remains unanswered about types of Teacher Corps impact on LEA inservice systems, especially those in larger (usually urban) LEAs. Project efforts most often concentrated on only a few of a larger number of schools, and consequently ran the risk of making little dent on the prevailing district inservice system, however successful they might be with the staff of project schools. The lack of impact in this situation was clear from several essays, such as the following excerpt from a mid-Atlantic, urban project:

> Just as an aside, I am a little confused about this question [about Teacher Corps contributions to an improved personnel development system]. Are you asking how we have impacted the inservice training courses run by the school system? Or, are you asking how we are impacting the process of personnel development in the LEA? If you are asking the first, the answer is--thus far, not at all. As far as the second, we have only increased the capacity of the systems trainers to help elementary teachers use an energy curriculum. We have only just begun our implementation. If our training model or some of the courses we develop prove successful, then we will be in a position to impact the process.

The apparent failures had to do with many factors beyond the degree of effort by Teacher Corps to involve LEA staff development personnel, although it was clear in many essays that "getting the ear" of the LEA district staff was especially important to do from an early stage in the project's life span.

Differential Impacts on Feeder System Schools--In response to a probe about feeder system differences, many essays indicated that projects had been more successful with elementary teachers than with secondary teachers. The theme was consistent across a wide range of project types. Documenters tended not to elaborate on the point in much detail, but the comments of a few shed light on the problem. From a documenter in a rural, southern project:

> Beginning in 1978, the high school principal and teachers joined the elementary school's ongoing inservice activities. Inservice education for the high school teachers, admittedly, has been approaching a dead end for three reasons--tradition, money and politics. They have been very vocal about their request for fringe benefits beyond the usual leave-time, tuition costs and graduate credit, even though no inservice activity is compulsory. Because prior inservice training activities, which formerly provided the elementary teachers with contacts with nationally known Teacher Corps consultants locally and in cities across the nation, are no longer available to the site school teachers due to 1980-81 budget restrictions, it takes revitalized efforts to keep inservice activities alive in the high school.

The newness of the high school element in Teacher Corps meant that a repertoire of effective techniques had not been built up. The secondary level brought with it, as well, a quantum increase in the problems associated with declining enrollment, especially in the urban high schools. Also, the sheer size and more fragmented nature of high school faculties made them difficult to work with, as a documenter in an urban, southern project pointed out:

> The elementary school faculties appear to be more cohesive and adaptive groups. For example, a smaller percentage of the senior high teachers participate in Teacher Corps activities, and these few have far greater absolute number of colleagues to influence and involve in new programs and ideas.

However, the magnitude of the problem was at the same time a source of opportunity, especially where the combined efforts of community members and training resources could be brought to bear on the problem. One such case described below, in a northwestern, urban project, spoke for a pattern seen in several other projects:

> Several concerns were expressed by the site school teachers which were addressed by the project through an inservice program. Burnout, stress, classroom management in particular, and the disruptive child provided us with a basis for developing a series of workshops, classes, and conferences dealing with the causes of these concerns and methods to understand them. In particular, a committee was formed at the high school to delineate a model for a positive school climate, and this has been very successful. The committee members met at length to discuss the various approaches and decided to meet with an outside consultant who has been in contact with the principal, the teachers, the staff, and the parents. One important outcome of the experiences offered by Teacher Corps has been a building cohesiveness brought about by the common goals, the course offerings, and the open communication which the project extends to the staff of the site schools.

Impacts on the IHE

While much of the attention in each project was directed at the LEA and its training needs (at least as reflected in these essays), these efforts simultaneously exerted influence on the IHE. In some projects this seemed to be a more central goal than in others. A number of factors seemed to contribute to the degree of attention to, and subsequent effect on, IHE training arrangements: the initial orientation of the IHE toward service projects and field-based training, the degree of initiative exercised by the IHE in Teacher Corps, the size and complexity of the IHE, and the involvement of key IHE power-holders in project planning.

In rough order of the amount of change in IHE training approaches or arrangements, the following kinds of IHE impacts emerge from essays.

First, individual faculty members were described as developing increased sensitivity to the needs or problems of teachers in low-income schools. The following quote, from a northeastern, urban project was typical of many:

> Through the Teacher Corps project, the IHE faculty has been involved in planning, consulting, and developing workshops and inservice courses in addition to credit-bearing ones. Having the staff of Teacher Corps become the agent for the district has led to a new awareness among the IHE faculty of the needs of the urban teacher.

Second, by gradual accumulation, IHE faculty with experience in Teacher Corps was in a number of IHEs developing a kind of "critical mass" of personnel oriented towards the problems of contemporary schools and especially toward the possibility of inservice support to schools. In another urban, northeastern project this took the form of an "alternative faculty," built slowly over several periods of Teacher Corps funding. In the words of the documenter:

> One of the major thrusts of our project is an effort to develop an alternative faculty [at the IHE]. Inherent in this concept is the notion that the provision of inservice must be onsite, collaboratively formulated, job-embedded, and individualized. Course titles serve only as parameters which identify the broad focus of instruction. Within those parameters, individual teaching needs and subsequent learning activities are mutually arrived at by the instructor and each participant. Thus, the diverse needs of the children from low-income families are addressed because those are the concerns which the teacher brings to the instructor during the inservice experience. Frequently the IHE instructor will be found working with children in the teacher's classroom. An additional plus to the type of inservice involvement we are providing is that the IHE instructors are becoming sensitized to the diverse needs of both children and teachers and are incorporating what they are learning in their preservice programs both as instructors and as members of teacher education curriculum planning teams.
>
> ...The fact that the IHE faculty has become involved with the Teacher Corps project, not only to assist the project but out of a realization that Teacher Corps is on the cutting edge of educational impact, is a welcome situation. The present documenter is able to view this phenomenon from experience with past Teacher Corps projects when such was not the case.
>
> The faculty views involvement with our inservice component as an opportunity to realize many of the practices which under regular or normal academic circumstances have only been "pie in the sky."

In a southern, rural site, also with previous Teacher Corps experience, the accumulation took the form of increased focus on inservice, coupled with the realization that faculty professional goals could be met through Teacher Corps:

> ...Issues related to inservice training at the IHE have moved to center stage. Professors of education realize that they can no longer afford to underestimate the training needs for themselves and also the experienced teachers whom they serve.
>
> The current IHE task is more a function of people and organized effort. A 2-hour block of time on Wednesday of each month is earmarked for IHE staff development activities. A variety of individual and group efforts are beginning to take root and grow. Professors participate in a project for different reasons. There is an increasing number of professors who view this Teacher Corps project as an opportunity for important

professional growth. They do not participate because they are "told to" in a "top-down" direction, but because they want to be more effective with the undergraduate program for training teachers as well as with Teacher Corps Program '78, where major emphasis is placed on inservice training of all teachers in the school district. But IHE professors also need intrinsic motivation in order to continue the delivery of inservice training. Teacher release time and stipends alone are not the only incentives for teachers to participate in helping others learn new skills. Affecting a student's performance and growth in positive ways may represent the best incentives for inservice training strategies.

Third, in some IHEs, Teacher Corps contributed to the revamping of courses and entire degree programs. Typically, the content of courses was reconstructed around the practical problems of the school or contemporary issues in education. In a substantial number of IHEs, degree programs were developed or revised to accommodate the requirements of inservice teachers in field-based settings. These kinds of changes in IHEs did not go unchallenged; the question of academic rigor was a principal complaint. In a mid-Atlantic, urban project, this manifested itself in the following way:

> The attitudes of teachers appear to be one of the more encouraging outcomes of the Teacher Corps training. Since they are able to define individual interests within the project focus, their motivation is more founded on the utility of such study. While some obeervers criticize this approach as not sufficiently rigorous for academic credit, the process is defended as being more meaningful and more directly related to professional role development. Consequently, the concept of academic rigor for professional training is in question, as supporters of this type of training maintain that academic rigor can also refer to the application of knowledge in settings which are serviced by professionals. Yet, within the School of Education, this latter concept is not the predominant view of those faculty who participate in the education of teachers.

A documenter in a northwestern, semiurban project summed up his experience over several periods of Teacher Corps funding in these words:

> The higher education system itself is a formidable obstacle to utilizing faculty for the inservice education of school personnel.
>
> If a set of university resources can be designed to help teachers meet a specific local problem--the procedures cost too much, or it's illegal. (And probably immoral and fattening, too.)

The words speak broadly for many essays that have alluded to resistances in the IHE to field-based training (see Quarter 3 Documentation summary). At the same time, the successes of this particular project and others like it were testimony to the value of local-level persistence in combination with long-term federal funding.

Appendix A

QUARTER 3 DOCUMENTATION ASSIGNMENT

GUIDELINES FOR THE ESSAY ON:

PROPOSITIONS REGARDING TRAINING/TEACHING

The Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations provide guidelines for operating local projects. A set of principles regarding the process of implementation could be derived from these operational guidelines; they can be viewed as tactics in an implementation strategy. The provisions of the Rules and Regulations can thus be reworded into the form of propositions regarding effective implementation processes or tactics. For this essay four provisions of the Rules and Regulations that deal with topics of training and teaching have been reworded into propositions. This essay is divided into four sections, one for each proposition. Each section should be started at the top of a page using as a heading the appropriate proposition from the list below. Each section should be a one to two page answer to the guiding questions suggested below.

Here is a list of propositions for this essay. (The number following each proposition identifies the section number in the Rules and Regulations that deal with this topic.)

1) Field-based and community-based training are effective implementation tactics for use in Teacher Corps projects. (172.50)

2) The use of integrated preservice and inservice training approaches is an effective implementation tactic. (172.63)

3) The use of multicultural education approaches is an effective implementation tactic. (172.62)

4) The use of diagnostic/prescriptive teaching approaches is an effective implementation tactic. (172.62)

Here are the guiding questions for each one to two page section of the essay. These questions should be applied to each of the propositions in the list above.

- Based on the experiences of your project so far, would you basically agree or disagree with this proposition. (For example, would you agree or disagree that the collaborative mode of operation is an effective implementation tactic for use in Teacher Corps projects?)
- How would you reword this proposition so that it would more accurately reflect the experiences of your project. What cautions or qualifications should be stated? What conditions should be noted? What elaborations would clarify the meaning, etc.?
- Please explain why you agree or disagree with this proposition, using one specific example drawn from your project's experience to illustrate your position.
- What other propositions about Training/Teaching would be important for federal policy makers to consider in developing Rules and Regulations for new educational programs?

COVER SHEET FOR THE ESSAY TOPIC:

PROPOSITIONS REGARDING TRAINING/TEACHING

Due Date: May 31, 1980 (Quarter 3)

Name of Project _____

Name of Documentor _____

Date Essay Submitted _____

Please complete the chart below, indicating with a check your agreement or disagreement with the proposition. Use your essay as a data source.

Agree	Disagree	
		1) The use of field-based and community training is an effective implementation tactic for use in Teacher Corps projects. (172.50)
		2) The use of integrated preservice and inservice training approaches is an effective implementation tactic. (172.63)
		3) The use of multicultural education approaches is an effective implementation tactic. (172.62)
		4) The use of diagnostic/prescriptive teaching approaches is an effective implementation tactic. (172.62)

Please list below any other propositions regarding Training/Teaching you think are important for federal policy makers to consider in developing Rules and Regulations for new education programs. (You may use an additional page.)

1) _____

_____

2) _____

98

Appendix B

QUARTER 5 DOCUMENTATION ASSIGNMENT

Group I

COVER SHEET FOR THE ESSAY ON
INSERVICE TRAINING FOR LOCAL SCHOOL TEACHERS

Due Date: November 30, 1980 (Quarter 5)

PROJECT: _____

DOCUMENTOR: _____

DATE ESSAY SUBMITTED: _____

The Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations allow each project to develop inservice training programs tailored to fit local circumstances. Which of the following represents the primary goals of your inservice staff development program for teachers? Indicate your answer by placing the number "1" in front of the several goals that are most important for your project; the number "2" in front of the goals that have moderate importance; and place the number "3" in front the goals that have little importance to your project. Please rate each goal with a single number: 1, 2, or 3. If any important goals are not included on the list, add them below with their rating indicated. If a particular goal does not apply to your project, indicate this with "NA" in the blank.

____ To improve diagnostic/prescriptive skills; to be sensitive to children's individual needs.

____ To provide better multicultural education.

____ To provide better education for exceptional children.

____ To improve classroom management skills (discipline, counseling, organization, and so on).

____ To improve attitudes of teachers (self-concept, empathy and so on).

____ To improve classroom and school climate.

____ To improve curricular and school programs.

____ To improve collaboration among teachers within a school.

____ To improve teacher-community communication and collaboration.

____ Other (please specify): _____

_____

____ Other (please specify): _____

_____

GUIDELINES FOR ESSAY ON INSERVICE TRAINING FOR LOCAL SCHOOL TEACHERS

One of the primary thrusts of each Teacher Corps project is to improve personnel development systems in the local education agency (LEA). In most projects, this means providing, expanding or altering inservice training for LEA teachers to focus on needs expressed by the staff of project schools.

From last year's documentation and other data sources in the Teacher Corps study, we learned a good deal about various objectives and formats of Teacher Corps inservice training activities. From this essay, we want to learn what your project has done in the area of inservice teacher training and how the training has contributed to the personnel development system in your project's LEA.

Your essay should be divided into three sections. The first should describe in detail the primary focus of your inservice training system. In the second, describe the actual training process as it has evolved so far--in other words, tell us what kinds of training experiences have been provided for LEA teachers. In the third section, reflect on the process in terms of its contribution to personnel development in the LEA. Each section of the essay should be 1 to 3 pages long.

Section 1: Primary Focus of the Inservice Training System

The guiding question for this section of the essay is: What are the most important things that teachers will learn or gain from participation in the inservice training system? We recognize that the teacher's job is very complex and that local needs vary considerably. Tell us briefly and specifically which aspects of teaching your training system primarily addresses. Use your responses to the cover sheet to help frame your answer.

Also, consider the following probing questions:

- To what extent does your project emphasize explicit, measurable objectives for teacher performance in its inservice training?
- To what extent has the focus of inservice training been defined by individual teachers?
- What specific in-classroom teacher needs are addressed by the inservice training program?
- In what ways, if any, are the goals of Teacher Corps training different from the goals of the IHE training available to teachers prior to, or outside the Teacher Corps project?
- In what ways do the goals of training reflect Teacher Corps' particular concern for the schooling of children from low-income families?

Section 2: Description of Inservice Training Strategy

The guiding question for Section 2 is: What have you done so far to put into action your inservice training system? Tell us briefly about your overall approach or strategy for staff development for teachers. Describe:

- The kinds of training events that have taken place.
- The sequencing of training events, or how one event builds upon others.
- The approaches for the delivery of training.
- The role of the IHE in providing inservice training.
- The role of the LEA in providing inservice training.
- Specialized kinds of expertise required to deliver inservice training.

Section 3: Contributions to an Improved Personnel Development System

Although Teacher Corps projects are still conducting inservice training, we are interested in the question: How has the Teacher Corps project contributed so far to improvement (if any) in the LEA's personnel development system? Give evidence that supports your belief that the project's inservice training system represents an improvement in the LEA's personnel development process. Consider:

- Changes in the number and types of people participating in the training.
- Previous inservice activities in the LEA, or the local schools. For example, are the inservice offerings now available through Teacher Corps significantly different from regular inservice offerings?
- In what ways, if any, does the IHE's involvement in Teacher Corps inservice training represent a shift from its prior training activities?
- What aspects of the inservice training have been particularly effective and why?
- What inservice training activities have you tried that you believe were not effective? Why do you think they were not effective?
- To what extent was the improvement expressed in different ways in different schools in the feeder system? For example, were there important differences between the elementary schools and the secondary schools?

In framing your answer, please resist the temptation to describe hoped-for or potential improvements. Concentrate instead on what has actually occurred since your project started, recognizing that ambitious plans may never be fully materialized. Also resist the temptation to give elaborate descriptions of what was done before Teacher Corps; focus on what is necessary to clarify what has changed. If you believe that it is too soon in your project's history to detect any major changes, please say so and briefly explain why.